

JAN 21 1934

The Classical Review

EDITORS { E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Prof. W. M. CALDER, LL.D., 58, St. Albans Road, Edinburgh.

All correspondence should be addressed to Prof. CALDER. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher.

Board of Management:

Prof. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A. (Chairman), representing the Cambridge Philological Society.

Prof. A. C. CLARK, Litt.D., F.B.A.

Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A.

Prof. H. A. ORMEROD, M.A.

Prof. H. WILLIAMSON, M.A. (Hon. Treasurer).

Representing the Council of the Classical Association.

E. A. BARBER, M.A. (Hon. Secretary), representing the Oxford Philological Society.

With the co-operation of Prof. E. K. RAND, Harvard University,
and Prof. W. J. WOODHOUSE, University of Sydney.

Vol. XLVII

DECEMBER, 1933

No. 6

CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
NOTES AND NEWS	209	REVIEWS (continued):	
THE SOPHOCLEAN ORESTES. S. M. ADAMS	209	Greek Mercenary Soldiers (Parke). W. W. TARN	226
ΕΚΠΑΘΕΩΣ ΚΑΙ ΕΚΠΑΘΕΩΣΙΝ. J. U. POWELL	210	Epidaurische Hymnen (Maas). J. U. POWELL	226
ΤΕΤΡΑΔΕΡΜΑ. T. C. SKEAT	211	In the Mountains of Greece (Kitto). A. M. WOODWARD	228
VARIA. II. J. D. DENNISTON	213	Römische Geschichte (Vogt-Kornemann). H. MATTINGLY	229
'VICTUM FRUSTRA CONTENDERE THYRSIM.'		Cicero: <i>De Natura Deorum, Academica</i> (Rackham). L. H. G. GREENWOOD	230
F. H. SANDBACH	216	Optische u. akustische Sinnesdaten in Vergil u. Horaz (Gauger). M. PLATNAUER	231
TWO NOTES ON THE PANEGYRICI LATINI.		Apulei <i>Opera quae supersunt, I</i> (Helm). D. S. ROBERTSON	232
W. S. MAGUINNESS	219	The Correspondence of Cicero, VI (Tyrrell and Purser); <i>M. Tulli Ciceronis ad Atticum Epistularum libri IX-XII</i> (Sjögren). E. J. WOOD	234
CATULLUS 53. 5. L. A. MACKAY	220	SHORT REVIEWS	238
Horace Odes, III. 12. 4-7. W. F. GOSLING	220	CORRIGENDUM	249
OX OR OWNER? W. M. CALDER	220	SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS	249
REVIEWS:		BOOKS RECEIVED	250
Homer and Mycenae (Nilsson). J. L. MYRES	221	INDEX	251
Indo-European Folk-Tales and Greek Legend (Halliday). H. J. ROSE	222		
The Jealousy of the Gods and Criminal Law at Athens (Ranulf). A. W. GOMME	223		
The Population of Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C. (Gomme). M. CARY	224		
Il Ciclope di Euripide (della Valle). G. MURRAY	225		

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET.

Price of the present number, 3s. net. Yearly subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3. Combined yearly subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on a payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 10s., *Quarterly* 13s.; combined subscription £1 15s.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 7s. 6d.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. F. C. G. Langford, 35, Alleyn Park, Dulwich, S.E. 21. Inquiries should be sent to The Triangle Offices, 61, South Molton Street, W. 1, addressed either to the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Miss E. C. Gedge and Mr. R. M. Rattenbury) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz., Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, Cardiff, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales, Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Southampton, South-Western, Sussex, Swansea, Taunton and West Somerset.

SMITH'S SMALLER LATIN-ENGLISH DICTIONARY

Revised Edition by J. F. Lockwood, M.A.

During the fifty years that have elapsed since the appearance of the last Revised Edition of Dr. Smith's 'Smaller Latin-English Dictionary' the researches of scholars have succeeded in producing more accurate texts of the classical authors and a clearer understanding of the character and history of the Latin language; and the teaching of the classics has simultaneously undergone some change. The primary object of the present edition was, therefore, to bring up to date the information contained in this dictionary and to provide the student with the means to a better appreciation of the meaning and usage of the words and language which he is handling. The whole of the text has been reset in larger type, in two columns. 9s.

JOHN MURRAY, 50 ALBEMARLE STREET, LONDON, W.1

ent and
ess upon
national
; (c) to
o create

the annual
fee of 5s.
Proceedings
Classical
Classical
scription
n is paid
n annual

er, Mr.
e sent to
the Hon.
ry) or to
ystwyth,
Leeds,
n, North
Western,

Y

last
the
the
y of
usly
was,
ary
the
The
9s.

V.1



The Classical Review

DECEMBER, 1938

NOTES AND NEWS

A GENERAL MEETING of the Classical Association will be held at St. Paul's School, London, on January 3-5. On January 4, at 5.30 p.m., the Dean of St. Paul's, Dr. W. R. Inge, will deliver his presidential address. On the previous evening there will be a reception at the Mercers' Hall.

The Year's Work in Classical Studies, 1933, will contain summaries and appreciations of recent work on Greek Literature, Latin Literature, Greek History, Roman History, Greek and Roman Religion, Roman Law, Greek Law, Greek Art, Greek Archaeology and Excavation.

THE SOPHOCLEAN ORESTES.

WE do serious injustice to the artistry of Sophocles if we think that the drama of Electra yields place to a presentation of the traditional Orestes when the time comes for Clytaemnestra to be slain. Orestes, of course, must strike the blow; but he is by that time a new Orestes, and the change in him is due to Electra.

He has come home δέκη καθαρής πρὸς θεῶν ὀρμημένος (v. 70). He has been trained from boyhood for the duty of avenging his father's murder (v. 14), and for that vengeance he has Apollo's sanction (vv. 35 ff.¹). Yet we feel at once that he lacks conviction or, at the least, that he entertains misgivings. This feeling depends, perhaps, more on the general tone of the opening speeches than on any particular verses; though I think the doubts expressed in vv. 59 ff. are less concerned with 'omens' (Jebb) than with the guilefulness of the course to which he has been committed. In any case, the point is soon made clear, as we hear from Electra, more than once, that he has ever been putting off the evil day.² And of course there is final proof of his doubts in vv. 1424-5—

¹ Whether or not the oracle was consulted as to the justice of the deed, the giving of directions for its accomplishment must imply such sanction.

² E.g., 167 ff. (δὲ λάθεται δη τ' ἔπαθ' Σὺ τ' ἔδαν . . . δει μὲν γὰρ ποθεῖ, ποθῶν δ' οὐκ ἄξιοι φανῆναι), 319 (φησίν γε φάσκων Νούδειν δέλγει ποτε).

'All is well within the house, if Apollo prophesied well.' He is, however, quite dominated by the loyal but coarse-grained Paedagogus and that for which the man appears to stand; nothing could more clearly show this than his silent submission when, though he thinks he may have heard Electra's voice, the Paedagogus's μηδὲν πρόσθεν ή τὰ Λοξίου κτλ. takes him from the scene (vv. 80-5).

That is Orestes before he meets Electra. We take him to be a young man of at least ordinary nobility and sensitiveness, brought up in an atmosphere of feud-hate to do, sooner or later, a deed of revenge from which any normal person must shrink. But that revenge has been the subject of much schooling by the Paedagogus and of many long talks with Pylades³; and he has steeled himself to carry it out, believing himself to be the instrument of divine justice. Until he meets Electra, Orestes the Purifier is, in fact, no more than that—a mere instrument of 'righteous vengeance,' his will and his feelings alike held in subjection to his purpose.

But then his own eyes are witness to his sister's sufferings; and for dramatic psychology few passages in Sophocles

³ Typically Sophoclean in this touch: οὐκ ἀν μακρῶν ἔθ' ήμιν οὐδὲν δὲ λόγων, | Πυλάδη, τόδ' εἴη τοῦργαν. The name Pylades shows that the reference is to long days of contemplation rather than to present talk.

rival the dialogue in the *άναγνώρισις*, vv. 1174 ff. In the space of some score of verses an automaton comes alive; the dull fires of a formal purpose are rekindled to burn with a strong but steady flame; the divine mission becomes informed with human emotion. Electra's love for him, her despair, and above all her pitiable lot, have made another man of him. His pity and wrath try to find utterance. 'O stranger,' she asks, 'why do you stare at me like that, and sigh?' He does not answer this; he speaks to himself:

ώς οὐκ ἀρ' ἔδη τῶν ἐμῶν οὐδὲν κακοῦ. 1183

The dialogue proceeds (in effect): 'Why do you say that?' 'Because I see that you have suffered much.' 'Ah, but these are only a small part of my sufferings.' 'But what could be worse?' 'I am living with murderers.' 'Whose murderers?' 'My father's—and I am forced to be their slave.' 'By whom?'

μήτηρ καλεῖται· μητρὶ δ' οὐδὲν ἔξισται. 1184

Whatever incitement to act Orestes needed, he has it now. There is no mention here of Aegisthus, but only of the 'mother who is no mother.' The dialogue has been constructed for one purpose, and from this moment Orestes prepares with cold determination for his deed¹; and the revenge which he takes on Clytaemnestra is revenge as much for Electra as for

¹ He is intent upon the business in hand, yet shows just enough genuine feeling for her: 1271-2, 1279. The dramatic effect achieved through his coldness is much greater than could have been achieved by attempting to match Electra's highly-wrought condition with excited emotion on his part. I imagine an actor would find the part to his liking.

Agamemnon. That is made clear immediately the deed is done:

ΗΑ. τίθηκεν ἡ τάλαινα; ΟΡ. μητέρ' εκφοβοῦ 1426
μητρόφων οὐ σε λῆμ διτυπού ποτε.

Thus has Sophocles wrought successfully, I think, to make this mother-murder tolerable or, at least, humanly intelligible; and in so doing he has kept the play Electra's. I would add the suggestion that we are intended to regard Electra, with all her sufferings and her emotions, as forming part of the divinely-ordered scheme of punishment. The noblest feelings of mortals² blend with the purposes of the God. That, I think, is an article of the poet's creed.

To all this the killing of Aegisthus is not anticlimax, for, with the other act accomplished, the play may end on the simple motives of the two chief characters, and be explicitly true to the religion of Apollo, of which Sophocles seems to be the representative. Aegisthus goes to his death. Electra's final words (vv. 1489-90) express the fulness of revenge; but those of Orestes (vv. 1505-7) express his mission as the bringer of retribution for evil deeds. With this mission the killing of Clytaemnestra has not, of course, been rendered out of keeping; but it has been blurred as a 'simple act of justice,' and this restatement of the case establishes the singleness of the whole design.

S. M. ADAMS.

Trinity College, Toronto.

² The nobility of Electra is fully attested in the second strophe and antistrophe (vv. 1082 ff.) of the chorus which follows the second scene with Chrysothemis. She is *δύσθι* and is upholding the Great Laws.

ΕΚΠΛΕΘΡΟΣ AND ΕΚΠΛΕΘΡΙΖΕΙΝ.

THE word *ἐκπλεθρός* appears in the Oxford text of Euripides, *Medea* 1181:

ἥδη δ' ἀρδλικῶν κῶλων ἐκπλεθρον ἡρόμου
ταχὺς βαδιστής τερμάτων οὐ θύγετο,

with a reference in the note to Galen, *De Sanitate Tuenda* 2, 10; and it is mentioned in Liddell and Scott s.v. *ἐκπλεθρίζειν* as a preferable reading in

Medea 1181, and rendered 'narrowing'; and *ἐκπλεθρίζειν* is rendered 'to run round and round in a course which narrows every time.' The passage in Galen runs thus:

Τοσοῦτον δέ τι καὶ τὸ ἐκπλεθρίζειν ἔστι καὶ τὸ πιπιλί-
ζειν· τὸ μὲν ἐκπλεθρίζειν δοτίς, ἐπειδός τις ἐπ πλεθρο-
τρόσω τε ἀμα καὶ ὅπλων διαθέων ἐν μέρει πολλάκις ἐφ'
ἐκάτερα χωρὶς καυτῆς ἀφαιρεῖ τοῦ μήκους ἐκάστοτε
βραχὺ, καὶ τελευτών εἰς ἐν καταστῇ βῆμα.

‘Ἐκπλεθρίζειν’ is when a man runs up and down on a course of a hundred feet many times out and back in each direction in turn without rounding the bend, and diminishes a little of the length each time, until finally he is reduced to one pace.’

Then follows a description of τὸ πιτυλίζειν. In this context Galen is recommending various ways by which a man can keep himself in good physical condition when he is not engaged in athletic contests. Πιτυλίζειν means much what we call Physical Drill, rising on tiptoe, and stretching and moving the arms; while ἐκπλεθρίζειν means literally ‘to run the πλέθρον out.’ Galen means that the runner first ran up the miniature course without turning at the bend (*χωρὶς καμπῆς*), and then back; then out again to some distance and back; then out again a shorter distance and back, then a shorter distance, and so on, and finally one pace out and back. It therefore resembled a favourite boys’ race, the Potato Race, still in vogue, only that the distances are inverted. There is no ‘running round and round,’ and the course is not ‘narrowing,’ as the Lexicon says, but shortening, and the translation should be altered accordingly. The error is repeated in Norman Gardiner’s *Greek Athletic Sports*, page 509: ‘ἐκπλεθρίζειν’ is the familiar running figure in which the runner runs in an ever-decreasing circle till he comes to the centre.’ The demonstration of the true meaning renders precarious the existence of the adjective ἐκπλεθρός in the *Medea* 1181-2, where the textual facts are that L has ἐκπλεθρόν, and the other MSS. ἐκπλεθρόν. The absurd scholium τὸ ὑπέρμετρον ἔαντον κῶλον ἀνέλκων points to ἐκπλεθρόν. The point of the comparison

lies in the rapidity with which Glauke recovered from her swoon: the βαδιστής to whom she is compared is ταχύς: but if the runner were ‘running the πλέθρον out,’ as Galen describes it, he would take a much longer time than if he were running the course in a race. Moreover, we should expect a comparison to be made with the familiar figure of a runner running a race, and not with the rarer figure of a runner keeping himself in training; just as we find the metaphor from a race in Euripides, *Electra* 883:

ἥκεις γάρ οὐκ ἀχρεῖον ἐκπλεθρον δραμάν
ἀγῶν' ἐς οὐκούς.

Similarly speed is the point of the comparison with a race in Euripides, *Electra* 824-5.

θᾶσσον δὲ βίρσαν ἐξέβειρεν η δρομεῖς
διστοῦν διαύλοντος ἵππος διήρυσεν.

We recognize then in the *Medea* some form of ἐκπλεθρός, not of ἐκπλεθρός. But should it be ἐκπλεθρόν or ἐκπλεθρόν?

Since a πλέθρον = about 33½ yards, a κῶλον ἐκπλεθρόν δρόμου would = 200 yards, and the complete δρόμος 400, since a κῶλον is half a δρόμος; but a κῶλον ἐκπλεθρόν δρόμου, ‘one limb of a course of 200 yards,’ would = 100 yards, and this shorter length is preferable in the context. This (ἐκπλεθρόν) is the text given by Reiske and Verrall, and it agrees with ἐκπλεθρόν δραμάν ἀγώνα in Eur. *Electra* 883-4, which clearly means a ἐκπλεθρός δρόμος, not a ἐκπλεθρόν κῶλον. Finally, I have little doubt in my own mind that Verrall’s correction of ἀνέλκων to ἀνακλῶν, ‘traversing the length of the homeward arm,’ is right, and no doubt at all that ἐκπλεθρός should be regarded as a ‘ghost-word.’

J. U. POWELL.

St. John’s College, Oxford.

ΤΕΤΡΑΔΕΡΜΑ.

THE new light thrown on the early history of the codex by the remarkable group of Biblical manuscripts on papyrus recently acquired by Mr. Chester Beatty and now in course of publication by Sir Frederic Kenyon may perhaps justify the following note. In *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* X No. 1294, a

letter of the late second or early third century, a correspondent asks his sister to receive certain articles, among which is a ‘sealed (?) chest containing two τετραδέρματα and a cloak.’¹ The

¹ Lines 3-4: χειλωμάτιον [ισφραγισμένο] τε
ἢ δύο τετραδέρματα καὶ ἱμάτιο <ε>.

editors translate the Greek word 'parchment quaternions,' adding the note 'τετράδερμον in the sense of quaternion occurs in *Martyrium Petri Alex.* p. 212.' Now not only are instances of vellum codices excessively rare in Egypt in the second, and even the early third, century, but in the Chester Beatty papyrus codices which date from this period the primitive form of a pile of single sheets, folded once down the centre to make one very thick 'gathering,' is still predominant; and the present passage, if correctly interpreted, must be the earliest example of a vellum codex made up of a number of small quires.

The story of the martyrdom of Peter, Bishop of Alexandria (d. 311), is most conveniently consulted in the critical edition of the original Greek text by the Abbé Joseph Viteau¹ (p. 79). The passage in question occurs when Peter surrenders to the Tribunes for execution; two passers-by approach from the direction of the Camp, and the Greek continues: καὶ οἱ δύο ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐπορεύοντο, ὁ μὲν πρεσβύτης τετράδερμον πωλήσαι, ἡ δὲ γραῦς ζυγῆν σινδόνων. The Bishop enquires: ποῦ πορεύεσθε; λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, ἐν τῇ πόλει, πωλήσαι τὰ ἔργα ἡμῶν . . . (οἱ τριβοῦνοι) ἔστησαν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν κοιλάδα δύον τὰ μυημένα. καὶ εἶπεν τῷ πρεσβύτῳ ὁ μακάριος, ἔκεινων ἰσταμένων ἀπλάσων τὸ δέρμα ἐν τῇ γῇ, καὶ τὰς δύν σινδόνας. καὶ ἀπλάσαντος αὐτοῦ, εἰσῆλθεν καὶ ἔστη ἐπάνω αὐτῷ. After the decapitation: οἱ πρῶτοι τῆς πόλεως ἐλθόντες ἄμα τοῖς σπουδαῖοις περιείλησαν τὸ σῶμα τοῦ μάρτυρος τῷ δέρματι δὲ ἦν ὑποκάτωθεν αὐτοῦ.

The unknown narrator, it is true, is not unduly troubled with scepticism, but still it is difficult to picture the body of the saint wrapped up in an exercise-book! Clearly the τετράδερμον must be something to go with the bed-linen (*σινδόνες*), in fact a leather mat-

¹ *Passions des Saints Écaterine et Pierre d'Alexandrie.* Paris, 1897. Cf. *Analecta Bollandiana* XI, p. 25⁴. The *Acta* of Peter are preserved in a rather bewildering number of Greek, Latin, and Coptic versions of which it is sufficient to say that the one chosen by the Abbé Viteau has the best claim to originality. Du Cange in the extract quoted below, used the Greek text printed in Combes, *Illustrum Christi Martyrum Lecti Triumphi*, Paris, 1660.

tress or ground-sheet. No doubt the δερμότυλα mentioned in *P. Lond.* V 1790, 5 and in the Lausiac History (see note ad loc.), like the τυλάρια δερμάτινα which figure in a fifth to sixth century inventory of Church property, *P. Grenf.* II No. CXI, 34, were leather mattresses or bolsters of a similar type rather than mere pillows (*προσκεφάλαια, κερβικάρια*). There can now be no doubt that this is also the correct interpretation of *P. Oxy.* 1294, 4; and it is equally clear that Grenfell and Hunt have in this instance merely relied for their information on Du Cange, or Stephanus, which reproduces him;² for in the *Glossarium mediae et infimae Graecitatis* s.v. ΔΕΡΜΑ we find the following:

τετράδερμον, *Quaternio ex pergameno.* *Martyrium S. Petri Archi-episc. Alexandr.* pag. 212. ἐν τῷ μέλλειν τὸν ἄγιον τελειοῦσθαι, κατ' αὐτὴν τὴν ὥραν, ὡς ἐκ τινὸς ἀποστολῆς, γυνή τις παρθένος καὶ πρεσβύτης, ἄμα τὴν πόλιν εἰσῆσαν, ὁ μὲν πωλῆσαι τὸ τετράδερμον, ἡ δὲ σινδόνας, etc. *Infra*, δέρματα nudè appellat.

Rare though this word is, it is interesting to note that it also occurs outside Egypt, for in a list of clothing, etc., scribbled on a house-wall at Dura on the upper Euphrates these items are found (ll. 24-29):³ προσκεφαλάδιν . . ., προσκεφαλά(δια) βόύα, ἄλλο προτκ(εφαλάδιν) . . ., τυλά(ρια) λιν(ῆ) β', ἄλλην τύλαν(?), τετραδέρμ(ατα) β'. By an incomprehensible oversight the editor, though quoting *P. Oxy.* 1294 in illustration, remarks that 'the editors translate as parchment quaternions,

² The Didot Stephanus gives as a second authority for the word τετράδερμον 'Nicet. Paphlag. Laud. S. Eustath. p. 212. Boiss.' This, however, is merely a blundered repetition of Du Cange's reference 'Martyrium S. Petri Alex. pag. 212'; and how Boiss(ondre) contrived to make two references out of one is explained, though hardly condoned, by the fact that Combes' *Lecti Triumphi*, whence Du Cange derived his text of the *Martyrium S. Petri*, also contains Nicetas' eulogy on Eustathius. This was kindly verified by Mr. Stephen Wright of the Bodleian.

³ Baur, Rostovzeff, and Bellinger, *The Excavations at Dura-Europos. Report on the Season 1930-31.* No. 300, pp. 153-6.

adding no comment.' Thus Du Cange's blunder once again escapes detection.

There is good reason to hope that further examples will be discovered by those who combine a familiarity with Byzantine Greek with time for the search; as I have not the advantage of either, I will conclude with an attempt to extend the history of the word in the other direction. In *P.S.I.* 678, a fragmentary list of articles, the following sequence of items is found (ll. 3-6): *σκυτοπ*[*τ*], *δορτα*[*τ*], *τετραδε*[*τ*], *σάγυματ*[*τ* *α* *κ.τ.λ.*]. Context no less than the absence of any alternative supplement compels the reading *τετραδέματα*. This papyrus, from the famous Zenon archive, dates from the middle of the third century B.C. (perhaps about 250), some four and a half centuries before the word re-emerges in *P. Oxy.* 1294; so

true is it that discoveries of this nature, instead of helping to complete our knowledge, rather expose our ignorance of the amazing technical vocabulary of the *koine*.¹

T. C. SKEAT.

¹ It will be noted that in the *Acta* of Peter the form of the word is *τετράδεμα*, while in the Oxyrhynchus letter we find *τετράδεμα*, pl. *τετράδεματα*. *τετράδεμα* looks like a back-formation from *τετράδεμα* treated as a neuter pl., and though I do not know if this is possible philologically, I think I can point to a similar phenomenon in the case of the word *ὑπόδημα*. In *P. Oxy.* 936, 25 and in Roos, *P. Groninganae* 11, 9 *ὑπόδημα* in the singular seems to be used collectively for a pair, or a consignment, of shoes (in the former instance the editors translate 'some (?) shoes'); and in Zereteli, *P. Ross.-Georg.* II 41, ll. 15, 32 we find a new singular *ὑπόδημα*, pl. *ὑπόδημα*, which appears far more likely to be a vulgar variant of *ὑπόδημα*, pl. *ὑπόδηματα*, than a misspelling of an (unattested) form *ὑπόδημαν*=*ὑπόδητης*, as suggested by the editor.

VARIA.

II.

EUR. *El.* 512-4.

τόμβῳ δ' ἐπ' αὐτῆς οὐ μελέγχιμον πάκῳ
σφάγιον ἔσθιον.

πυρᾶς δ' ἐπ' αὐτῆς: 'on the very spot where the pyre stood, though *πυρά*, like *rogus*, was sometimes said of the tomb or monument,' Paley; 'au haut du bûcher même,' Parmentier; 'on the altar itself, as opposed to the *τύμβος*,' Keene, who on 1.92 says 'not of course the funeral pyre in the strict sense . . . perhaps . . . a mere synonym for *τάφος* . . . but more probably an altar erected near the tomb.'

As to *πυρά*, *Pi. I.* 8. 126, *E. Hec.* 386, *I.T.* 26, *Ion* 1258, *Tro.* 483, and *Hdt.* VII 167-71 make it clear that *πυρά* can stand for *βωμός*. That is the natural meaning here, and there is no need for forced interpretations. But why *αὐτῆς*? *αὐτός*, 'self,' distinguishes a thing from something ancillary, or in general germane, to that thing. But the *πυρά* is ancillary to the *τύμβος*, not vice versa: *τύμβον* ἐπ' *αὐτῷ* would be intelligible, but not *πυρᾶς* ἐπ' *αὐτῆς*.

Now S. *El.* 900-1 reads

τύμβον προσείπον δέσσον· ισχάτης δ' ὄρῳ
πυρᾶς νεώρη βύστρυχον τετμημένον.

And the two *Electras* show so many points of resemblance in detail that (whichever of the two was written first) one can be used to interpret the other. I suggest *πυρᾶς* δ' ἐπ' *ἀκτής*, 'on the edge of the altar,' corresponding to *ἐσχάτης πυρᾶς* in Sophocles. Cf. *O.T.* 183 *ἀκτὰν παρὰ βώμον*: A. Cho. 722 *ἀκτῇ χώματος* (and the *Choephoros* was naturally much in Euripides' mind when he wrote his *Electra*). This sense of *ἀκτή* is sufficiently rare to account for the very slight corruption.

EUR. *H.F.* 965-6.

τίς δὲ τρόπος ξενώσεων | τηδεῖ;

Wilamowitz says that *ξένωσις* (not found elsewhere) is based on *ξενοῦσθαι* = *ἐπὶ ξένης εἶναι*, *ἀποδημεῖν*, for which sense he compares E. *Hipp.* 1085, Fr. 1, S. *Trach.* 65. But in these passages *ξενοῦσθαι* means 'to be made a stranger' ('banished': at *Trach.* 65 Herakles' mission is a banishment) or 'to be made a guest (entertained).' 'Entertainment of a guest,' L. and S., etymologically unexceptionable, but quite unsuited to the context.

'Strangeness of conduct' (Paley, Gray and Hutchinson) seems clearly on the right lines. But these scholars

offer no evidence in support of their rendering. *ξενοπάθειν*, *ξενοπάθεια* are used (see L. and S.) by Plutarch and Soranus (a medical writer of the second century A.D.) in the sense 'malaise.' *ξένωσις* is presumably a technical medical term meaning 'alienation': cf. *alienatio mentis* (Celsus, Pliny, *Digest*), and *alienatio* alone, *Sen. Ep.* 78. 9 'si incitatio (dolor) est, in alienationem soporemque convertitur' (? a swoon).

1092-3 *πνοὰς θερμὰς πνέω | μεράρτι*, *οὐ βέβαια,*
πνευμόνεως ἔτοι.

So punctuated in O.C.T. The medical use of *μετάρτιος* and *μετέωρος* leaves no doubt that *πνεῦμα μετάρτιον* is shallow breathing (*sublimis anhelitus*), when one feels as though the breath came from the throat, not from the lungs. If so, the comma after *βέβαια* should be removed: 'not steady breathing from the lungs.'

1094-7 *ἴδοι, τι . . . | πρόσειμι θραυστῷ λαῖψῃ τυπ-*
σματι | η μὲν νεκροῖς γέλοντας θάκους ἔχω.

So the MSS. *πρόσειμι*, which could only mean 'I am added to,' and *η μέν* are clearly corrupt. The corrections *πρὸς ημιθραύστῳ*, *ημαι*, and *ἔχων* are generally adopted. But they are not completely satisfactory. On the analogy of other *ημι-* compounds *ημιθραύστῳ* should mean 'half-broken,' not 'broken in half' (*διχορραγής* 1009). The word seems only to occur elsewhere in *Anth. Pal.* IX 568. 5 *ημιθραύστον αὖλιον* (a farm half destroyed by a flood), and *Lyc.* 378 *ημιθραύστοις ιψροῖς* (where, though 'broken in twain' is the most natural rendering, 'half destroyed' is not impossible). Further, we should perhaps expect the proximity of the corpses to be introduced in an independent clause. Certainly Herakles is not unaccustomed to the sight of death; but there is a curious casualness about this participial afterthought.

We should read, I think, *θραυστῷ πρόσημαι*, which could easily be altered to *πρόσημαι θραυστῷ* by a copyist who substituted direct for inverted order (see Headlam, *Agamemnon*, on ll. 219, 405, 563, *C.R.* XVI 243 f., and Pearson, *C.R.* XXIII 170, on S. O.T. 976), and then to *πρόσειμι metri gratia*.

It is true that *θραυστός*, in itself a

rare word, is particularly rare in the sense 'broken,' usually meaning 'fragile' (see L. and S.). But the compound *ημιθραύστος* implies the sense 'broken' for the simple adjective. And the pure passive sense (with no idea of possibility) is in general the commonest sense of those adjectives in *-τός* which are physical in meaning (Kühner-Blass, ii. pp. 288-9). Many of these adjectives express both the completion of an action and the possibility of its completion: *τμητός*, 'cut' and 'cuttable'; *ἐλαχέτος*, 'rolled' and 'rollable' (to say nothing of the active sense of, e.g., *μερπτός*).

ἢ μήν, for *ἢ μέν*, keeping *ἔχων*, is the easiest change, but not at all apposite. *καὶ μήν* is what we need, 'And see!' (as often). The corruption is probably due to *-ημαι* above.

1206-8 *βάρος ἀντίπαλον δακρύους συναμιλλάται*
ἰκετεύομεν ἀμφὶ γενεῖδα καὶ
γόνου καὶ χέρα σὸν προπίτνων, πολιόν τε
δακρύων ἐκβάλλων.

βάρος ἀντίπαλον, δακρύους συναμιλλάται, ικετεύομεν Professor Murray. It is no fatal objection that *συναμιλλάτης* is not found elsewhere. But what of *ικετεύομεν . . . προπίτνων*? The change from a *real* plural (*συναμιλλατάι* = Amphitryon and Theseus) to the singular participles can hardly be justified: unless, indeed, we suppose that Theseus chimes in with *ἀμφὶ . . . προπίτνων*, and Amphitryon proceeds with *πολιόν . . . ἐκβάλλων*. But if *ικετεύομεν* is a *stylistic* plural, standing for a singular, there is no difficulty in finding exact parallels for the change of number (Kühner-Gerth, i. § 371. 3).

Hermann's *βάρος ἀντίπαλον δακρύουσιν ἀμιλλάται* is generally read by editors. But it is very variously interpreted. Hermann himself, followed by Paley, takes *βάρος* to mean 'a weighty motive' (viz. friendship for Theseus). But *βάρος* must surely mean 'load of sorrow.' Wilamowitz paraphrases: *καὶ ἐνθάδε βάρος ἔστιν ἴσθροπον τοῖς σοῖς δακρύοις· ἔγώ γαρ καὶ ικέτης εἰμὶ καὶ δακρύω καὶ ἀντός.* He cites schol. on *Il. Ω* 509 'Ἀχιλλεῖ ἀναδιπλασιασθεὶς ὁ θρῆνος ἀντισηκαθήσεται τοῖς δάκρυοι Πριάμον: and compares, for the meaning of *ἀμιλλάσθαι*, 'es mit etwas auf-

nehmen,' Hipp. 426 μόνον δὲ τοῦτο φασ' ἀμιλλᾶσθαι βίφ, γνώμην δικαίαν κα- γαθήν. But it is impossible to supply τοῖς σοῖς with δακρύοις.

I think that Hermann's emendation is right, but that the line should be taken as self-contained, and as gnomic (it reads like a bit of Democritus): 'equipoise of sorrow contends against tears': i.e. 'a sorrow shared is a sorrow halved.'

1234-6 Θη. οὐδεὶς ἀλλάστωρ τοῖς φίλοις ἐκ τῶν φίλων. Ηρ. ἐπήνεα· εἰδέ δράσας δέ σ' οὐδέ δακρύοις. Θη. ἔγω δὲ πάσχων εἰδέ τούτον οἰκτίρω σε τὸν.

'Wenn du mich gemahnt hast (1228) das geschehene ohne murren zu tragen, so lasse ich das wenigstens von deiner rettung gelten,' Wilamowitz. But the reference seems too remote, the connection of thought too obscure, for the quick thrust and parry of stichomythia. On the other hand Paley's 'I am aware that you are under an obligation to me, i.e. that we are friends,' is weak. I think that σε should be taken ἀπὸ κοινοῦ with both verbs: 'having benefited you, I do not now reject you.' Arist. E.N. 1167b 17 οἱ δὲ εὐεργέται τοὺς εὐεργετηθέντας δοκοῦσι μᾶλλον φίλειν ή οἱ εὐ παθόντες τοὺς δράσαντας, καὶ ὡς παρὰ λόγου γνούμενον ἐπιζητεῖται (Thuc. II 40. 4 shows that the question was discussed in the fifth century). ἐπήνεσα ('I thank you': here with no idea of rejection) shows that H. is touched by the moving words Th. has just spoken, οὐδεὶς ἀλλάστωρ τοῖς φίλοις ἐκ τῶν φίλων: εἰδέ . . . ἀναίνομαι shows that he further recognizes the tie which binds the benefactor to the benefited. Taken so, 1235 leads up to 1236 well: H. 'I will not reject the sympathy of a man to whom I did good.'—Th. 'Nor I withhold pity from one at whose hands I received good.'

AR. Eccl. 273-7.

ἡρίκ' δὲ δέ γε τούτους (τοὺς πάγκυρας) δικρύσσητε περιηρμοσμένας, καὶ βασιάτας τάνδεις γ' ἀπερ ἐκλέψατε ἐπαναβάλλεθε, καὶ ταῦς βακτηρίας ἐπεριθύμεναι βαδίζετε.

What is the point in saying, 'And when, in addition to other articles of your disguise, you have fitted on your beards, fling your cloaks *too* over your shoulders, and then march'? The

apodosis, the climax, ought to come in at 'march,' not before. And so it does, if we read ἐπαναβάλλεθε, and make καὶ apodotic, as it often is in κἀτα, κἀπειτα, opening the main clause after a participial clause: Ar. Eq. 392, Nu. 624, Av. 536, 674, Lys. 560: Pl. Gorg. 457B: add perhaps E. Cyc. 235. The use is clearly colloquial. Here a finite protasis, not a participial one, precedes. But in the apodotic uses of particles it is generally speaking indifferent whether the protasis is expressed in participial or in finite construction: and cf. X. Cyr. IV 3. 14 μή, εἰ δεῖσθε . . . , κἀπειτα. . . .

Plat. Rep. 621B: καὶ οὐτως, ὁ Γλαύκων, μῦθος ἐσώθη καὶ οὐκ ἀπώλετο, καὶ ἡμᾶς ἀν σώσειν, ἀν πειθώμεθα αὐτῷ.

καὶ οὐκ Α: δὲ οὐ FDM.

Similar language is used in Phlb. 14A: Tht. 164A, D: Lg. 645B. Photius (cited by Stallbaum on Phlb. 14A) μῦθος ἐσώθη· ἐπίρρημά ἔστι λεγόμενον ἐπ' ἐσχάτῳ τοῖς λεγομένοις μύθοις τοῖς παιδίοις. (For a different, and most improbable, explanation of the phrase, given by schol. ad loc., see Adam.) Before μῦθος Stallbaum adds ὁ from Par. K, 'quippe qui salvis linguae legibus abesse non possit.' But in a proverb or in a quotation from poetry the absence of the article is justifiable (and cf. Tht. 164D καὶ οὐτω δὴ μῦθος ἀπώλετο ὁ Πρωταγόρειος). Photius may be right about the proverb, but the proverb may have come from poetry. Even allowing for the prevalence of iambs in Greek prose, the sentence has a strong iambic bias, and it is no far cry to

οὐτως ἐσώθη μῦθος, οὐδὲ ἀπώλετο, ἡμᾶς δὲ τούτους, ἀν πειθώμεθα.

(It is even possible that Plato preserved the οὐδέ, and that καὶ οὐκ and δὲ οὐκ are alternative prose equivalents, both equally admissible.)

Phaed. 103A: Καὶ ὁ Σωκράτης παραβαλὼν τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ ἀκούσας, 'Ανδρίκως, ἔφη. 'Turning his head,' Burnet: 'Capite admoto. Nam ille summissa voce locutus erat,' Stallbaum. As to the first, παραβάλλειν is to 'put alongside,' not to 'turn' (περιάγειν): as to the second, the translation seems right,

the explanation wrong. If the unknown speaker spoke in a low voice, it would have been in the Greek manner for the narrator to tell us so. Socrates, I believe, jerks his head out to the side, as a deaf man would do, without bending or turning it, with an air of quizzical interest, half ironic half serious: 'I mustn't miss a word of this.' It is a gesture, possibly characteristic, which consorts well with what we know of Socrates' mannerisms: and it seems a mistake to assign it to a physical cause.

Gorg. 450A: "Ἐλεγές τοι νυνδὴ ὅτι. . . . τοι νυνδὴ Β³Ρ: τοίνυν δή Β (ut videatur) Τ: τοίνυν νῦν δή Φ.

In this passage of formal argumentation (458E-59C) each step is marked by a connective (459B 1 is no true exception): nor, in such passages, can connectives well be omitted. *τοίνυν* therefore seems right. As *τοίνυν δή* is only found elsewhere in *Lg.* 718D, I believe that F's *τοίνυν νῦν δή* (or rather *νυνδή*) is right here, and that in *Lg.* 718D we should read *τὰ τοίνυν <νυν>δή λεχθέντα, νῦν* having been omitted through haplography.

Ant. V 16: ἔπειτα δὲ οὐχ ὡς πιστεύων τῷ πράγματι ἀναμφισβητήτως ἔνα τὸν ἀγόνα περὶ τοῦ πράγματος ἐποίησα, ἀλλὰ ἀμφισβήτησον καὶ λόγον ὑπελίπουν ὡς καὶ τοῖς τότε δικασταῖς ἀπιστήσων.

For *τοῖς τότε* Thalheim reads *τοῖς ἐνθάδε* (and other emendations have been proposed). But *καί* has then little force. The transposition of *τοῖς* and *τότε* mends the sense: ὡς καὶ τότε τοῖς δικασταῖς ἀπιστήσων: 'Even before the trial began you had made up your mind to refuse to accept the verdict of the jury, and had left yourself the loophole of a second trial, before the Areopagus.' *ἀπιστήσων* stands for *μέλλων ἀπιστήσειν*, 'intending not to accept': cf. E. H.F. 477 *νύμφας ἡρόθιναζόμην, κήδη συνάψουσα*: Pl. *R.* 498C *προθυμότερον ἔτι ἀντιτέίνειν οὐδ' ὄπωστιοῦν πεισομένους.*

Philostr. *Imag.* II 19. 1: σκηνοῦσι δ' ἐπ' αὐτῷ Φλεγύαι βάρβαροι πόλεις οὕτω δύτες. Men can hardly 'be' cities. ? πόλεις οὐ ποιοῦντες (οἱ οὐν οἰκοῦντες).

II. 32. 3: καὶ αὐτοὶ δὲ οἱ μαζοὶ μικρὰ τῆς ὄρμῆς παραφαίνονται ὥσπερ ἐν μειρακιῷ ἀπαλῷ. *όρμης* is very strange. Perhaps *όργης*. *όργη* is not found in the sense of 'ripeness,' 'fulness': but this sense must lie behind *όργυς*, though it may have passed early out of general use: Philostratus Senior shows a certain leaning towards archaism and preciosity. For the confusion of *όργη* and *όρμη* in MSS, see Jebb on *S. El.* 1283: also E. *Supp.* 1050.

J. D. DENNISTON.

Hertford College, Oxford.

VICTUM FRUSTRA CONTENDERE THYRSIM.

THE seventh Eclogue of Virgil recounts a contest between two shepherds, Corydon and Thyrssis. The narrator, Meliboeus, repeats their alternate quatrains; after six pairs he concludes with the words *haec memini et uictum frustra contendere Thyrsim.*

La Cerdá attempted a poetical adjudication on each round, and decided four times for Corydon and twice for a draw. But Heyne could see no distinction in merit, and since his time nearly all the editions I have consulted are either perfunctory or suggest that Thyrssis' lines are hardly, if at all, inferior to those of Corydon. Page is perhaps the most extreme. 'Of course, however,' he writes, 'the defeat of

Thyrssis is wholly fictitious, and no one would have been more astonished than Virgil himself if anyone had taken him literally and pointed out to him the defects in the lines which he assigns to Thyrssis.'

Such a view is a natural reaction against such unrestrained criticism as that which made Corydon win the fourth round because his subject is summer, while Thyrssis takes the unpleasant topic of winter.¹ Yet even Page recognizes the arrogance of Thyrssis' first quatrain and the absurdity of the offer of a golden statue to Priapus in the second. These faults might

¹ Conington repeats this.

have been an encouragement to look for others in other quatrains. Indeed Benoist, without explaining why, finds Thyrsis' images and comparisons inexact; and Voss conducts an exuberant attack on Thyrsis, quatrain by quatrain. Forbiger thinks that Thyrsis, after holding his own at first, loses on the last round. These scholars to some extent anticipate the criticisms of the end of this article. But first I wish to call attention to what is, as far as I know, an unnoticed fact—that in two places Thyrsis' lines depart from Virgil's usual practice in versification.

35 *nunc te marmoreum pro tempore fecimus: at tu, si futura gregem suppleuerit, aureus esto.*

It is the practice of the author of the *Culex*, and of the author of the *Aetna*, as of the satirists, to put a strong stop before the sixth foot of the hexameter. It is not the practice of Virgil. In the *Elegies* and *Georgics* i-iii Virgil never elsewhere begins any kind of new clause with the sixth foot of the hexameter unless the new clause *either* repeats the conjunction by which the preceding one was introduced, e.g.

E. v. 83 *nec percussa iuvant fluctu tam litora nec quae saxosas inter decurrunt flumina valles*¹

G. i. 314 *spicea iam campis cum messis inhorruit et cum frumenta in uiridi stipula lactentia turgent*²

or is introduced by *quantus* or *qualis*, taking up a preceding *tantus* or *talis*, e.g.:

E. ix. 11 *sed carmina tantum nostra ualent, Lycida, tela inter Martia quantum Chaonias dicunt aquila ueniente columbas.*³

In the fourth book of the *Georgics* a new type appears. Besides cases like

¹ So E. vi. 39, ix. 48, G. i. 80, 223, ii. 539, iii. 24, 357, A. i. 603, ii. 665.

² So G. i. 370, iii. 133, 428, A. v. 713.

³ So E. vii. 51, G. iv. 412. G. iii. 271 *continuque auidis ubi subdita flamma medullis* (*uere magis quia uere calor reddit ossibus*), *illae* etc. may be thought only just to escape the rule by virtue of *continuque*. This half-exception is in the latest of these books.

G. iv. 65 *ipsae condidunt medicatis sedibus, ipsae intima more suo sese in cunabula condunt,*⁴

where the two clauses are connected by epanaphora of a word other than a conjunction, we also find other (but always closely connected) clauses:

G. iv. 6 *at tenuis non gloria si quem numina laeua sinunt*
71 *Martius ille aeris rauci canor increpat et uox auditur fractos sonitus imitata tubarum.*⁵

This is the prevalent type in the *Aeneid*. Epanaphora, earlier the rule, only occurs in i. 341, 603, ii. 665, v. 713, and in some few cases like

xi. 170 *et quam magni Phryges et quam*
In iv. 541 (*nescis heu perdita, necdum* |), v. 623 (*o miserae . . . o gens | infelix*), v. 633 (*nullane . . . ? nusquam | . . . ?*) we have it in a concealed form.⁶ But the majority of cases are like G. iv. 6⁷ or 71.⁸ Sometimes this rhythm is used to give an impression of speed as in

xii. 355 *sistit equos biiugis et curru desilit atque semianimi lapsque superuenit.*

In six places in the *Aeneid* Virgil begins the sixth foot with an independent clause; in every case it is to give this impression of speed. The rhythm has this effect through the annihilation of the accustomed pause at the end of the line.

iv. 416 *Anna, uides toto properari litore; circum undique conuenere: uocat iam carbasus auras.*

593 *diripientque rates alii naualibus? ite, ferti cibi flammas, date tela, impellite remos.*

ix. 220 *'ad celere mus' ait. uigiles simul excitat. illi succedunt seruantque uices.*

The other examples are x. 153, 195, xii. 526.

⁴ So G. iv. 305, A. i. 341.

⁵ G. iv. 258, 265, 442 are, I think, rhetorically, though not grammatically, parallel.

⁶ Cf. Bentley on Lucan i. 253. Perhaps A. iii. 433 *praeterea si qua est Heleno prudentia, uati si qua fides* should be included here.

⁷ So ii. 458, iii. 151, 219, 695, ix. 512, 692.

⁸ So ii. 217, vi. 117, xi. 429, xii. 355.

Thus, though we find that Virgil's practice changes, yet when he begins a clause with the sixth foot he either avoids pulling the line up before it by minimizing the stop or, if the stop is heavy, employs it for a particular effect of speed. Thyrsis' line has neither of these justifications. It stands outside the whole of Virgil's practice, not only outside that of his early work. To my ear, its weakness is emphasized by the fact that we have hardly recovered from the stop after *fecimus* when we must stop again before the clause *si futura gregem suppleuerit*.

The second metrical point concerns the second elision in

41 immo ego Sardoniis uidear tibi amarior
herbis.

In the *Eclogues* the only other elision in this place is ii. 48, *bene olenis anethi*, where *bene olenis* is almost a single word. In Virgil's other works elision of a pyrrhic here is extremely rare (Norden *Aeneis* vi, p. 454): *G.* i. 469, *A.* iii. 290, vii. 25, 529 (all before *et*), iii. 447 (neque *ab*), ii. 675 (*rape in*), vi. 52 (neque *enim*), 201 (*graua olenis*), x. 459, xi. 556 (*ita ad aethera satur*), and two instances with *tibi*, with which I will next deal.

There is only one place where Virgil elides *tibi* freely—before the second foot. Of this there seem to be twelve examples. Before a long syllable elsewhere in the line there are three examples (*G.* iv. 456, *A.* vi. 716, viii. 133). Of elisions before a short syllable four are in the less strict first foot (*G.* ii. 118, *A.* vi. 483, 852, viii. 475). Besides these there are four cases, all involving special circumstances:

(a) *E.* vi. 6 nunc ego—namque super tibi
erunt qui dicere laudes
A. vi. 373 nihil o tibi amice relictum.

Here *tibi* has forced its way between words properly belonging together: *super tibi erunt* and *o tibi amice* form very close groups.

(b) *A.* ii. 605 hebetat uisus tibi et umida
circum.

Elision before *et* is notoriously more free.¹

(c) *A.* viii. 84 quam pius Aeneas tibi enim,
tibi, maxima Iuno.

Here *tibi* is closely connected with *enim*.

I see no such excuse for the elision in Thyrsis' line. Thyrsis is singing for a prize. If he twice utters verses containing a harshness contrary to Virgil's own practice, it appears to me that Virgil meant him to lose marks thereby in the contest.

If we admit weaknesses in Thyrsis' versification as well as in his character, we may perhaps look still further for reasons why he loses. The following criticisms are subjective, it must be confessed. I put them briefly.

25 *Pastores, hedera nascentem ornate poetam,*
Arcales, inuidia rumpant ut ilia Codro.

Arcales is badly placed and over-emphasized, comparing badly with Corydon's *Nymphae, noster amor, Libethrides*.

51 hic tantum Boreae curamus frigora quan-
tum
aut numerum lupus aut torrentia flumina
ripas.

It is Boreas who might properly be compared to a wolf or a torrent, rather than the man who avoids the wind by staying indoors (so also Voss).

57 aret ager; uitio moriens sitit aeris herba,
Liber pampinea inuidit collibus umbras;
Phyllidos aduentu nostrae nemus omne
uirebit,
Iuppiter et laeto descendet plurimus imbr.

Monotonous lines, end-stopped, and tending to begin with proper names. But they are the response to a very varied quatrain by Corydon, beginning with the challenge of

stant et juniperi et castaneae hirsutae.

(Voss found a pompousness in *Liber* and *Iuppiter plurimus*, and pitied Phyllis her likelihood of a wetting.)

65 fraxinus in siluis pulcherrima, pinus in
hortis
populus in fluuiis, abies in montibus altis;
saepius at si me, Lycida formonse, reuisas
fraxinus in siluis cedat tibi, pinus in hortis.

It is absurd that the beauty of Lycidas should depend on his visits to Thyrsis (so also La Cerda), let alone on their frequency. If Thyrsis did not intend to emphasize *saepius*, he should not have inverted *at*.

¹ The fact that the line belongs to a cancelled passage is probably irrelevant.

Thus I would maintain that every quatrain of Thyrsis contains one or more weaknesses. Weaknesses of character, which are all that many editors admit, may be irrelevant; weaknesses of versification and weaknesses of sense

are not. Virgil had a feeling for the dramatic. He was not flouting it when he wrote *et uictum frustra contendens Thyrsim.*

F. H. SANDBACH.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

TWO NOTES ON THE PANEGYRICI LATINI.

PLINY'S *Panegyric*, 77, 7.

Quippe etiam fortuna uideatur indignum, si possit honores dare qui gerere non possit.
uideatur—possit—possit *Madvig*, uideatur—possit—posset *M. indignus Kukula*, *indignum codd.*

Madvig's correction (*Adv. Crit.* 1871-3) is printed in the subsequent Teubner texts, but the former *lectio vulgaris*, *uidebatur—posset—posset*, appears in Landgraf's *Historische Grammatik*, vol. 3 (1903), p. 150.

Madvig wrote 'Nullus est praeteriti temporis significacioni locus,' but in Landgraf *uidebatur* is quoted in illustration of the imperfect indicative used, like the imperfect subjunctive, in a present sense. A study of Pliny's usage in such cases proves the unsoundness of this explanation, and of the reading *uidebatur—posset—posset*.

The examples are: *Epist.* III, 5, 16; IV, 17, 9; VI, 2, 4; VII, 15, 1; X, 61, 4. Adding VI, 31, 5; VIII, 14, 2; IX, 28, 3, probable cases of the usage, we find it limited to (a) *erat* with a neuter adjective, (b) the imperfect of the 'modal' verbs *possum* and *debo*, thereby falling within the limits laid down in Madvig's *Latin Grammar*, § 348e and Obs. 1.

Kukula's correction *indignus* for *indignum* is bad. *Indignum* is the *lectio difficilior*; there is no palaeographical reason for the error implied, and this construction of a neuter adjective with a conditional clause occurs several times in the speech (v. ch. 7, 6; 9, 4; 31, 5). *Indignum* gives a satisfactory sense: 'It would seem a state of things unbecoming his position, if—.'

Eumenius, *Pro Instaurandis Scholis*, 20, 2.

... quidquid inuictissimi principes urbium gentium nationum aut pietate restituant aut uirtute deuincent aut terrore deuincent.

This, the favourite reading of the editions, was admitted by E. Baehrens into his Teubner text (1874), the consensus of MS. authority being in favour of the obviously erroneous *deuincent—deuincent*. R. Novák¹ in 1901 suggested *comprimunt*, comparing *Pan.* VII, 4, 4.² W. Baehrens³ objects, I think fairly, because the rare clausula - u // - u is entirely avoided in this speech. But to *deuincent*, which he retains in his Teubner text (1911), and which is quoted in the *Thesaurus, sub voc.*, there are two objections more serious still, viz. :

(a) I cannot find, nor does the *Thesaurus* quote, a case of *deuincio* with *terror*, or any word meaning 'fear,' as its subject or instrument.

(b) *Deuincio* occurs six times in the *Panegyrici Latini*, but *never* in the sense of 'forcible restraint,' required here. It has always its far more common sense of securing *voluntary* adhesion by peaceful means, of winning men over by a sense of obligation. The examples are: *Pan.* X, 11, 4; VIII, 20, 3; VI, 10, 4; IV, 34, 4; III, 24, 2; I, 93, 3. The first three cases are the most striking:

X, 11, 4. The voluntary nature of the tie described by *deuinxeris* is stressed in the antithesis of *uota pietatis* and *timoris obsequia*.

VIII, 20, 3. *P. 11. 4. ut metu, deuincent!* Yet Baehrens⁴ quotes the passage in support of *terrore deuincent*.

VI, 10, 4. 'qui deuinctos habet uenia perduelles' is opposed to 'qui calcat iratos.'

I conclude that the error was due,

¹ In *Panegyricos Latinos Studia Grammatica et Critica* (Prague), p. 188.

² All quotations refer to the order of the speeches in W. Baehrens' Teubner text (1911).

³ *Panegyricorum Latinorum Editionis Kouae Praefatio Maior, etc.* (Groningen, 1910), p. 51.

⁴ *Ibid.*

not to a slip in spelling *deuinciunt*, but to dittography of *deuincunt*, whereby a word has been displaced.¹ I suggest that the lost word was *compescunt*, and

¹ v. Fronto, *ad Caes.* Lib. V, XLII, 57 (Naber, p. 88), and Maius' note *ad loc.* for a similar situation produced by dittography of *probatus*: cf. F. W. Hall, *Comp. to Class. Texts*, pp. 192-3.

CATULLUS 53. 5.

Di magni, salapantium disertum.

The word *salapantium*, taken from *Sen. Contr.* 7. 4, is not much clearer in meaning or etymology than the *salapantium* of the Catullan manuscripts. As neither word occurs anywhere else, it is quite possible that the form *salapantium* may be itself corrupt.

Pliny says (*N.H.* 29. 92), *Est et formicarium genus venenatum, non sere in Italia; solipugas Cicero appellat, salpugas Baetica. Certain minor manuscripts read soliputas. These creatures are mentioned also in *N.H.* 8. 104; 22. 163; and *Lucan* IX. 837. The word seems to be formed from *solum*, the sole of the foot (*Lucre.* I. 927; *Varro R.R.* 1. 47; 2. 9), and *pungo*.*

The form *solipugium* is not mentioned in any lexicon; but the ending *-ium* is very common for compound substantives in the *sermo plebeius*. (See Cooper, *Word Formation in the Roman Sermo Plebeius*, pp. 302-305.)

Solipugium would fit in well with Seneca's remark about the *brevis statura* of *Calvus*, and also with the vehemence of his invective. Though like the scorpion, with which Pliny and *Lucan* couple it, the insect was rather African than Italian, it may well have been familiar enough to *Catullus'* contemporaries to offer material for the jest. The various spellings in the manuscripts of Pliny show that the word was sufficiently unfamiliar to the mediaeval scribes to be easily misspelt.

L. A. MACKAY.

University of Toronto.

HORACE, ODES III. 12. 4-7.

Tibi qualum . . . puer . . . aufert, Neobule,
Liparaei nitor Hebri
simul unctos Tiberinis umeros lavit in undis.

As in *C. iii. 7. 23*, so here the choice of a river-name for a young man is strange: and here the local adjective is strangely chosen. Usually the word is an epithet of *Vulcan*. (See Mayor on *Juvenal XIII. 45*.)

Possibly Horace here had in mind the Greek λιπαρός (cp. Ar. *Plut.* 616 λιπαρός χωρῶν ἡ Βαλανεῖον). The word is found in Latin in another connection (Pliny 23, 9, 81, § 162); and in this passage of the *Odes* the reading of most of the MSS is *liparei*.

It is just possible that both river-names (*Enipeus* and *Hebrus*), being Thracian, are associated with *Dionysus* and that in him we

that the dittography was caused by the homoeoteleuton *deuincunt* and *compescunt*. *Compescunt* provides the exact sense required,² and the clausula by far the most common in this speech.

W. S. MAGUINNESS,

University of Sheffield.

² Cf. *Publ. Syr. M* 49; *Pan. I*, 80, 3.

have the typical radiant youth. It is a coincidence that in *Arist. Eg.* 536 we find

Θεοσθαι λιπαρός παρὰ τῷ Διονύσῳ.

W. F. GOSLING.

Oakham School.

OX OR OWNER?

THE Lairbenos dedications introduce us to a world of pure oriental theocracy, strange in a hellenized land under the Roman Empire. To Mr. Salisbury's interesting parallel (*C.R.* XLVII, p. 62) I would add another probable link between these inscriptions and the Semitic East.

The inscription published in *Ramsay, C.B.*, p. 149, no. 42 (= *M.A.M.A.* iv, no. 286), runs as follows:

[Χρ]ησιμος ἀπόλλωνι Δι[μερηπω]α]
εβάμενος ὑπέρ τοῦ κοι[λοθέ-] (leaf)
πτον βοὸς διά τὸ οὐτε[ρηκενα]
καὶ μὴ παραγεγον[ειν εἰ στήλ-]
5 π εὐηήμα [λαστηρίον εύομοδογ-]
ω εβάμενος εὐηγολαίστησ-]
[τηγερε].

In ll. 2-4, down to παραγεγονέιν, the reading, as restored by *Ramsay*, is not open to doubt; the rest is uncertain in detail, but the general sense is clear.¹ This confession has always been regarded as the record of its author's chastisement, on the body of his ox, for failure in his ritual duty. It seems more probable that both offence and punishment were those of the jibbing (or dawdling) ox which, unlike the θεθαρος βοῦς πρὸς βαμάν εὐθάμω πατῶν of *Aeschylus, Agam.* 1297 f., was late for the sacrifice; such at any rate seems to be the natural meaning of the Greek. Punishment of oxen for a graver delict is prescribed in *Exodus* 21, 28-32, and in the Code of *Hammurabi* (see *Mühl, Untersuchungen sur alt-orientalischen und althellenischen Gesetzgebung, Klio*, 1933, p. 35 ff., where reference is also made to *Plato, Laws*, IX, 873B and *Dion. Hal. II.*, 74). In cases where his negligence was proved the owner of the ox might be involved in the punishment for its offence, and was in any case responsible for damage done:

¹ In l. 4 ff. perhaps we should restore καὶ μὴ παραγεγον[ειν τῇ εορτῇ εὐθίμω] [name of festival, ending in] ω εβάμενος εύομοδογ- τηγερε.

see Exodus *l.c.*, and the inscription quoted by Ramsay *l.c.*, probably from the neighbouring and similar Hieron at Koula: *αὐτόντης οἱ Ἀρέμωνος τοι τὸ κατηχθὸν στηλάριον ὑπὸ τοῦ βοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος Ταρεῖ*. It therefore seems likely that the offence, like the punishment, specified on the inscription of Chresimos was that of his

ox. This is none the less likely that in another confession to Laibenos (*M.A.M.A.* iv., no. 281) the dedicator says that he was punished *διὰ τὸ μῆτρα βούλεοθε ταῦτα τοστάθει καὶ παρεστάνει τῷ μωσητηρίῳ καλούμενον*.

W. M. CALDER.

University of Edinburgh.

REVIEWS

HOMER AND MYCENAE.

Homer and Mycenae. By MARTIN P. NILSSON. Pp. xiv + 284, 8vo; 56 illustrations. London: Methuen, 1933. Cloth, 21s.

PROFESSOR NILSSON'S books on *The Minoan-Mycenaean Religion* and *The Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology* are well known, and this expanded version of his recent lectures in London is in the main a sequel to the latter. Beginning with a retrospect of 'Views and Methods in the Homeric Question' and especially of the more recent forms assumed by the old separatist and unitarian theories, he insists on the significance of the myths as 'the premises of Homeric poetry,' and the need for clear ideas as to their age and their transmission, and as to their historical content. But the myths are not the only elements in Homer that link the poems as we have them with the Mycenaean Age. To enable us to appreciate this point, Dr. Nilsson attempts an historical reconstruction of the Mycenaean Age from the archaeological, linguistic, and documentary evidence, and formulates his own theory of the way in which Greek-speaking folk established themselves gradually, in successive migrations, in Greek lands. Though he has a separate chapter, later, on 'State Organisation in Homer and in the Mycenaean Age,' he has not quite realized the conditions of such movements, and speaks (pp. 62, 83) in the old familiar way of 'nomads' when he appears to refer to communities which were habitually sedentary, though liable to be displaced, like all 'Balkan' peoples, by stronger neighbours. Hence some confusion of thought as well as of terminology in the discussion of pot-fabrics and the like (p. 63). There are some other phrases which suggest that Dr. Nilsson is less at home among material objects

than in dealing with mythology and literary transmission. In what sense is the civilization of Phylakopi 'fundamentally indigenous,' or the Lion-slab at Mycenae 'foreign to the spirit of Minoan art'? What are the 'menhirs' in the Dendra tomb? He presses rather hard Dr. Fürst's very guarded concession of the possibility of regarding early Argolic crania as 'northern'; on the other hand he rejects Ridgeway's equation of 'Achaean' with Celtic. But then, for some people 'Celts' are not 'northern.' It is also not always clear what he means by 'Achaean': on p. 104 the Achaeans seem to be defined as 'Arcadian-speaking Greeks'; but does this fit the facts, or cover the whole of his argument that 'the Greek Great Empire was theirs' (p. 108)? For they were 'reinforced by fresh and strong waves of immigrants' early in Late Minoan times, and some of these late-comers both founded dynasties and had un-Hellenic names. When it comes to construction, moreover, Dr. Nilsson seems to rely more on traditional chronology than his rejection of Greek genealogies warrants.

The chapter on 'Datable Elements of Civilisation in Homer' contains much useful material, and a considerable allowance for Mycenaean survivals: but 'the Mycenaean elements are not distributed according to the age of the strata in the poem' (p. 159), for instance the boar-tusk helmet in the *Doloneia*.

The clue to this puzzle Dr. Nilsson seeks in the history of 'Homeric language and style,' and in conclusions as to the 'Origin and Transmission of Epic Poetry' derived from study of epic technique among other peoples. And so we come back to the Homeric use of myths and similes, and the theory of Herodotus that 'Homer and Hesiod made for the

Greeks their gods' and still more their heroes and heroic wars.

Though not always easy to follow, through his wealth of material and

original presentation of it, Dr. Nilsson is always suggestive and many of his fresh points are well founded.

Oxford.

J. L. MYRES.

FOLKLORE AND MYTHOLOGY.

Indo-European Folk-Tales and Greek Legend. By W. R. HALLIDAY. Pp. vii + 158. Cambridge: University Press, 1933. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

EVER since K. O. Müller set scientific mythology going, the questions of the age and provenance of the tales the ancients tell have occupied a prominent place in all serious researches. To answer such questions it is every now and then necessary to resort to conjecture; and if this is not to become a guessing competition, with prizes of temporary popularity for the cleverest and most ingenious guesser, but lead to solid results, clear understanding is needed of two points: first, what kinds of guess cannot be right, and second, what kinds may be, in that they can produce reasonably close analogies for the processes of development which they postulate. It is to the credit of British scholarship that it has performed the first service not once but twice at least. Andrew Lang more than any other one man drove the theory of sun-myths and all its very dull meteorological kin from the field; Principal Halliday has rendered a less conspicuous but highly useful service in ridding anyone who knows anything of folklore of the nonsense of *Sagenverschiebung*. In this book he heals certain wounds which too hasty folklorists have inflicted on mythological science, and does it with his usual charm.

That some Greek tales are *märchen*, fairy-stories pure and simple, is now generally recognized. The danger of this is that we may try to find fairy-tales where none exist; or, if we really are dealing with them, to suppose them necessarily old; or thirdly, if the tale is really there and really old, to imagine that in the particular field of Greek mythology it must date from prehistoric times and bear reliable evidence to the manners and customs of the earliest

ancestors of the Greek peoples or of the primitive Wiros. In this little book, a rearrangement for publication of its author's Gray Lectures for 1932, with additions from other of his opuscula, there are contained excellent studies, based upon wide knowledge, of several central and typical problems which the mythologist must face.

After a brief introduction, setting forth the well-known threefold distinction between myth, legend and *märchen*, Principal Halliday discusses the general problem of Indo-European folktales, their peculiar character and the manner of their distribution. It is one symptom of his general soundness that he is neither a distributionist nor a polygenetist, but ready to discuss each case on its merits. Here the evidence for the distribution of several groups of tales each from some one centre is overwhelming; it does not follow that there was but one centre for all (India for example), or that the distribution was always in one direction, as east to west. And, an important point, stories which are in process of distribution, especially by word of mouth, are subject to the most complex processes of change, usually in the direction of breakdown and degeneration. This is further illustrated in the next section (Chap. iii) on the relation of certain Greek tales to India. Legend then has a chapter to itself, the author's views being very close to those of Nilsson with regard to the date of origin, historical content, and value for the reconstruction of early history of these sagas. The rest of the book adds practice to precept by analysing, fruitfully and well, the legends of Prokne and Philomela and of Perseus, also the fable of the Goat and the Vine. The results are briefly that, while Perseus may be a real person, the whole of his story is fairy-tale, with perhaps a trace here and there of early relations with the

Near East; Prokne and Philomela as we know them are but Sophokles' handling, a little retouched, of one of the many tales based on the habits and songs of birds; the fable shows, in its insistence on the root of the vine, a trace of its kinship to a story in which the beast is not eating a vine at all, but

some plant whose root was used for tanning or dyeing.

In a well-printed book it is perhaps worth noting that on p. 72, line 11, 'brother' should be 'brothers,' while on p. 108, n. 1, the abbreviation *Rer(um)* has become *Rev.* H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

ENVY AND PUBLIC LAW.

SVEND RANULF: *The Jealousy of the Gods and Criminal Law at Athens.* Vol. I. Pp. 161. London: Williams and Norgate (Copenhagen: Levin and Munksgaard), 1933. Paper.

THIS book, well written, well translated, is part of an extensive enquiry into the origin of 'the disinterested tendency to inflict punishment,' i.e. for wrongs done to others, which is displayed in two ways, by a belief that the gods punish human injustice (wrongs done by one man to another, not to the gods themselves), and by the intervention of the community to punish injustice—public law (criminal law, it is called here). Dr. Ranulf has made the enquiry for Athens, and here deals with the sixth century and the first half or two-thirds of the fifth, principally with the evidence of Solon, Aeschylus, Sophocles and Herodotus (whose ideas he regards as entirely Athenian); in a second volume he is to discuss Euripides, Aristophanes and Thucydides. His treatment is methodical and careful: but his conclusions quite unconvincing, owing to a complete misunderstanding of the evidence. He finds that the disinterested tendency to inflict punishment, and therefore public law, have, in Greece at least, their origin in envy: the gods punish because they are envious of human happiness; the community punishes because the masses are envious of the powerful few. In Homer, he says, there is neither envy nor the disinterested tendency ('gods as well as men are indifferent to the wrongs inflicted on others than themselves'); in Athens of the fifth century both, to an extreme degree; public law began with Solon's institution of *γραφαῖ*, indictments which anyone

might bring, not only the victim. But there is disinterested punishment in Homer, both by gods and by men; by gods, for instance, of perjury, of wrong done to a guest, of refusal to help a suppliant; it explains nothing to say, with the author, that these were regarded as wrongs done to the gods, and so punished by them only in revenge: why did men think they were wrongs done to the gods? And public law did not start with the *γραφαῖ*; the *δίκαια φόνοι* were just as much part of it—it is the community's intervention in the trial, not the question who brings the indictment, that is important. Hence the elders of Homer who deal out *θέματες* are equally punishing 'disinterestedly'; and in fact the 'disinterested tendency' is found in communities far more primitive than the Homeric; only not among the Cyclopes.

To get any support for his view that in the fifth century envy was thought to be the only motive for divine punishment, Dr. Ranulf has to argue that Aeschylus, Sophocles and Herodotus were unable to distinguish between what we should call deserved and undeserved misfortune; not only was the action of the gods in punishing human success in all cases 'just, moral and edifying,' but the Greeks did not observe any difference between the cases of, for instance, Clytemnestra and Antigone, of Adrastus, Polycrates and Cleomenes; 'to be happy is equivalent to ordinary crime for Herodotus'; the gods punish any kind of success, they compel a man to commit a crime or 'trap' him into it (*ἔδεε γάρ οἱ κακῶς τελευτᾶν*).

'The question by what right the gods ruin men . . . cannot have

been of as much interest to the Greeks as it is to modern readers of their literature. . . . They must have found gratification and edification in the very fact that the gods bring down ruin upon men, irrespective of right or reason. Every case in which the gods triumphed over the guilty or innocent victims of their cruelty must have evoked a feeling of satisfaction among the spectators, not varying with the types, but identical for all types.'

This all-embracing envy! Why was Homer taught in their schools? No wonder the author finds his conclusion startling, and considers it impossible

for modern readers 'to feel at home with' Aeschylus.

It would have made another doubt his conclusion. To observe that the rain falls both on the just and the unjust is not to confuse justice with injustice; if you believe rain comes from the gods, you are faced with a problem which the Greeks attempted to solve in many ways, and were not the last people to find difficult; as difficult as the other problem of determinism (*εδεῖ οἱ κακῶς τελευτᾶν*) and moral responsibility. That they did not achieve a satisfying, logical solution is true; but their attempts were not as empty of thought as Dr. Ranulph believes. A. W. GOMME.

A. W. GOMME.

University of Glasgow

THE POPULATION OF ATHENS.

A. W. GOMME: *The Population of Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.* Pp. vii + 87; 1 map. Oxford: Blackwell, 1933. Boards, 5s. THOUGH the materials for computing the population of Athens have scarcely grown since the time of Boeckh, the conclusions drawn from them have remained bewilderingly diverse, because of the inherent difficulties of interpreting them. In this close-packed little volume Mr. Gomme has systematically reviewed the evidence and assessed its value in the light of a plentiful common sense and knowledge of modern population-statistics.

The author shows that little information can be gleaned from official inscriptions, such as lists of *Ephebi*; that the number of *Thetes* cannot be determined with any approach to accuracy; and that the ratio of slaves to freemen fluctuated greatly. Our calculations therefore must rest mainly on the statements of historians about army-strengths, notably Thucydides' statistics for 431 B.C., and Diodorus' for the Lamian War, and on some stray data about Athenian corn-consumption.

Mr. Gomme makes out a strong case for accepting Thucydides' estimate of the Athenian active army in 431 at some 14,000 to 15,000 men, and of the reserves at 16,000. He points out that the latter

number is not too large, since the metics included in it could hardly be fewer than 5,500, and many citizens of military age would not be fit for active service. (Given 10,500 citizen reservists of age eighteen to sixty, about 8,000 would be of age twenty to fifty: this total probably contains, besides the 'unfits,' a good many 'indispensables.')

In estimating the corn-consumption of Athens c. 350 B.C. the author assumes that the imports from districts other than the Crimea were far larger than Demosthenes declared. But statistics about imports were kept, and probably published, by the Sitophylakes and customs officers. The total consumption, and the total Attic population, in mid fourth century, should therefore be put somewhat lower than 250,000 to 275,000, as estimated here.

Mr. Gomme remarks that the proportion of citizens reputed to be worth less than 2,000 drachmas in 322, viz. 22,000 out of 31,000, was unaccountably low (especially in an age of soaring prices). Could these figures have been taken from the assessment-lists for *εισφορά*, where understatements were probably not rare?

In regard to the slave population, Mr. Gomme leaves the servile land-workers out of the reckoning. But since his estimate of one male domestic to each

adult seems unduly liberal, we may accept his figure for the maximum male slave population, viz. 85,000.

The author goes on to show that in the fifth and fourth centuries more and more members of rustic demes became resident in Athens and Piraeus. Incidentally he disposes of the belief that local representation was carefully upheld in apportioning seats to the Boule.

Finally, he argues that exposure of infants (off the stage) was not a common practice. This tallies with Professor Nilsson's conclusions about Roman infanticide (*Imperial Rome*, p. 326).

Altogether, this is a capital contribution to ancient population-statistics.

M. CARY.

University of London.

THE CYCLOPS.

EUGENIO DELLA VALLE: *Il Ciclope di Euripide tradotto in versi italiani con un saggio critico sul dramma.* Pp. 101.

Bari: Laterza, 1933. Paper.

THIS is a fine and sympathetic study of a play which has perhaps not been sufficiently appreciated. Dr. della Valle takes the *Cyclops* to be a mature work of Euripides, dating from the last years of the fifth century, and finds in it the full Euripidean psychology: on the one hand sophistic analysis and the sense of 'debolezza umana' and on the other a wistful longing after that ideal heroic past in which he would believe if he could. (I had treated the *Cyclops* as an early work; not from strong conviction, but because, since Euripides at some time abandoned the satyr-play for the pro-satyr, it seems natural to put his one satyr-play earlier than the pro-satyr *Alcestis*. The language also is markedly different from the poet's later style. It is in many ways like that of the *Rhesus*, which if genuine at all must be very early. Kaibel on more specific grounds took the same view.)

Odysseus, Dr. della Valle insists, is in the *Cyclops* a really noble and heroic character, brave, generous, mindful of his honour (*Cycl.* 198, 480, 299, 694, etc.). His tears (405) are as much due to shame for a moment of weakness as to pity for his companions. The figures of Silenus and the Satyrs, though ridiculous, are also inspired by an idyllic 'nostalgia' for the life of nature in a sort of Golden Age. But the most subtly conceived character of all is Polyphemus, so purely 'natural' as to be 'bestial,' with not a thought beyond

himself and his direct sensual desires, and yet, through this very quality of primitive unintellectuality, reaching the same outlook on life as the most cynical Sophists (323 ff.). Dr. della Valle speaks with appropriate severity of the assumption of Wecklein that Polyphemus' sentiments represent Euripides' own philosophy, and the contrary arguments of Nestle to show that they do not.

The essay is well worth reading. The main criticism which suggests itself is a doubt whether Dr. della Valle is not taking this charming burlesque rather too seriously. If we possessed some other treatments of the *Cyclops* story we should be able to see whether there was much in this play that was at all unusual or specially characteristic of Euripides. On our present evidence it looks as if the story itself *plus* the satyr atmosphere almost inevitably determined the characters, and that a satyr-play on this subject by Sophocles or Aeschylus would not, in general tone, have been very different from this.

The essay is accompanied by a translation. Greek goes well into Italian, and, as far as a foreigner can judge, this translation seems to convey with lightness and grace the meaning of the original. As a technical point it is interesting to notice how freely Dr. della Valle uses a trisyllabic ending to his blank verse, turning it from hendecasyllable to dodecasyllable. E. g.:

'Come mi stan negli antri i nuovi piccoli?
Gia sotto i fianchi, forse, ed ai capezzoli . . .'

G. MURRAY.

Oxford.

GREEK MERCENARIES.

Greek Mercenary Soldiers, from the earliest times to the battle of Ipsus. By H. W. PARKE. Pp. viii+243, and 2 tables. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933. Cloth, 12s. 6d.

THIS book is well done down to Chaeronea, and supplies a detailed and valuable collection of material; it gives ample references, and brings out certain points clearly, such as the hopeless state of the Greek world in the earlier fourth century and the importance of Dionysius I as a model for others; above all, the fact that so long as the city state was healthy the mercenary was of minor importance. The handling of the reforms of Iphicrates and Chabrias is excellent; Mr. Parke has really tackled the peltast question, and his conclusion that before these two generals peltasts were light-armed javelin-throwers and after them were serious infantry who could supplement, and even take the place of, hoplites is undoubtedly correct; quite apart from Diodorus, much of the later history absolutely necessitates this. One might query some items about Philip, and remark that the Macedonian hypaspists were not light-armed troops and that the form of the name shows that the sarissa must be very old; but, generally speaking, had the book ended with Chaeronea it would deserve little but

praise. But with Alexander a new world begins, and he and the Successors cannot be satisfactorily treated as an adjunct to the earlier period. The chapters on Alexander are distinctly disappointing, and do not even give a full conspectus of his employment of mercenaries; the two most important matters—his Cretan archers, most famous of Greek mercenary corps, and the function of the much-debated 'second line' of mercenaries at Gaugamela—are not even mentioned. These chapters could have been cut down to mere figures—Parke has some which may be useful—and the space utilized for the general summary, which is all too brief. It contains a noteworthy suggestion (which merits fuller treatment) that the mass of fourth-century mercenaries was due less to political exile than to the economic distress of the small farmer. But one needed a fuller discussion of pay and conditions of service, and several other things deserved consideration, notably the very important question, never yet studied—how far is the known mass of mercenaries in the later fourth century consistent with current ideas of the population of Greece? But perhaps this would be asking too much.

W. W. TARN.

EPIDAURIAN HYMNS.

Epidaurische Hymnen. Von PAUL MAAS. Pp. 33; 3 photographs. (Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft.) Halle (Saale): Niemeyer, 1933. Paper, RM. 5.

WHEN Hiller von Gaertringen in 1929 published *IG* iv, 1² containing the text of several hymns from the temple of Asklepios at Epidaurus, whence the Paean of Isyllos had previously come, he expressed his expectation of a treatise upon them by Paul Maas. This expectation has now been fulfilled, and a careful and suggestive edition is here presented to us. The Hymns are of varying merit; the first, 'To all the Gods,' contains lyrical and epic ele-

ments, and includes two lines taken bodily from Σ 484-5, a sign of poor and probably late work; although in Dr. Maas' opinion the lyrical part may be much older. The second, to Pan, is a pleasing poem of eighteen trochaic dimeters, composed in a literary style and completely preserved except for one word. The third, to the Mother of the Gods, is more than usually noticeable for its matter, metre, and style. I will not repeat here what I have written upon it in *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature*, Third Series, pp. 204 foll., except to say that it is a vivacious narrative written with a light touch in simple language of the lyric

Kοινή and in acephalous Glyconics, the metre used by and named after Telesilla, the Argive poetess who flourished at the close of the sixth century B.C.

In its conflation of *Μήτηρ* and *Δημήτηρ* it resembles the story told in the Stasimon of Euripides, *Helena*, 1301 foll., and Dr. Maas has some interesting suggestions to offer. He would remove the words *τὰ τύμπαν’ ἐλάμβανε* which occur twice, in lines 12 and 14, thereby certainly improving the structure, although he candidly admits that he can offer no reason for their insertion. But it is a coincidence that the words *τύμπανά τ’ ἐλαβε* are used in the *Helena*, 1347, of *Κύπρις*, and a suggestion is mentioned that some words which described the action of *Κύπρις* here may have fallen out; she then, and not Zeus, would be the other person in the dialogue. Indeed that something has gone wrong with the middle of the inscription is clear, for the Mother's reply cannot have begun with *kai*, as the inscription makes it do. Dr. Maas has now grown cold towards his earlier conjecture *ἀβρόταν* (= *ἀμβροσίαν*) for the corrupt *σύρουσ’ αρπα[.]τα[.]*, but it still remains the best suggestion offered. The retention of the hiatus *ημενον οὐρανῶν* (*ώρανῶν*?) in 21 is also acceptable, in spite of *ἀπ’ ωρανῶ* in l. 2. On the other hand his suggestion *κ[ό]τω* in l. 8 does not help matters, for it still leaves the corrupt *ρημενα*: much preferable is the suggestion of Professor Robertson and Mr. D. L. Page that the letters *κ[.]τωρ* are a careless repetition of *κατ’ ωρεα* in l. 6. The second appearance of *τὰ τύμπαν’ ἐλάμβανε* mentioned above may be a similar dittography.

Lastly he makes the interesting suggestion that the composer of the Hymn is Telesilla herself, pointing out that she composed hymns to other gods and mentioned a temple in the Argolid. 'As long as no weighty objection is brought forward, the Hymn must be ascribed to Telesilla.' The ascription

is appropriate, but the objection does exist, that of the conflation, not of *Μήτηρ* and *Δημήτηρ* (for this appears in Melanippides as well as in Euripides), but of *Μήτηρ*, *Δημήτηρ*, and even *Ἑκάτη*, in respect of Hekate's condominium in the universe (Hesiod, *Theog.* 412 foll.). The close reasoning of Dr. Farnell (*New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature*, Third Series, p. 207) that the Hymn is 'a learned imitation, illustrating the process by which the old servid realities of polytheism faded into playthings of literature,' led him to conclude that it is a later Prize or occasional composition; and this view, also held by Mr. Tod, is still preferable to Dr. Maas' theory given on his page 140. Another difficulty, of which Dr. Maas is indeed conscious, arises from such forms as *δρη*, *μέρη*, and in particular *ἀν*, for which he suggests the correction *αι*. Attic forms are not consistent with Telesilla's date, but only with a redaction.

The rest of the book is taken up with Aiphron's Paean to *Τύεια*, the fragment of Likymnios' Hymn to *Τύεια*, fragments of the Epidaurian Hymns to Asklepios and Pallas, and the inscription, now preserved at Cassel, in which *Τελεσφόρος* is celebrated as the *νέον θάλος* of Paian-Asklepios, and corrections of them are offered. This word *Τελεσφόρος* appears throughout accented proparoxytone, which is no doubt deliberate; but it is contrary to the practice of the editors of all texts in which the name occurs (for instance, Keil in Aristides, Or. 49, s. 22, and Hitzig-Bluemner in Pausanias ii, 11. 7, who print it paroxytone); except the solitary instance of Kaibel in Athenaeus xiv, 616c. There is also a suggestive treatment of the difficult and corrupt Stasimon in Euripides, *Helena*, 1301 foll., and the photographs with which the book concludes are excellent.

J. U. POWELL.

St. John's College, Oxford.

IN THE MOUNTAINS OF GREECE.

In the Mountains of Greece. By H. D. F. KITTO. Pp. x+150; 4 photos. and 1 map. London: Methuen, 1933. Cloth, 6s. net.

UNLIKE the great majority of British tourists, the author of this little book chose to visit Greece in the summer rather than in the spring, and to wander with his wife among some of the less frequented regions of Greece, camping out at night for choice. In spite of the heat he has survived to tell the tale, and moreover to tell it extremely well. The first part of their trip lay in northern Greece, which they crossed from Lianokladi to Missolonghi, exploring the tangled mountain-mass that includes the peaks of Vardousia and Tymphrestos, where heavy rains, unexpectedly encountered, interfered with their plans but not seriously with their enjoyment. Their Peloponnesian trip lay mostly in Arcadia, where they made Karytaena their centre and walked to Olympia and back, camped out at the temple of Bassae, and finally made their way north-eastwards over the top of Chelmos to Diakophto. In the last chapter a visit to Thera is attractively described.

The book is pleasantly got up, and, with a few trifling exceptions, accurately printed. We note Πολλά (p. 6); φαγετοῦ (p. 26); Sophocles twice (pp. 105, 106); Fraser for Frazer (p. 126); the intriguing entry in the Index, 'Admiralty, British (see Aristotle),' refers to pp. 22 f. and not to p. 28. And, to the reviewer at least, 'ouzo' and 'Spyrou' look less familiar than ouzo and Spyro. The four photographs whet the appetite for more.

Mr. Kitto says in his Preface, 'We went out to Greece for fun. . . . We wandered about at our leisure, behind the mule that carried our luggage, saw what came along, and thoroughly enjoyed ourselves.' But this care-free attitude, independent of fixed programmes and time-tables—on one occasion they planned to catch a boat which had ceased running fifteen years before—was not the sole source of their enjoyment, for they reveal themselves as lovers of the beautiful where flowers

and landscape are concerned, and as sympathetic and amused spectators of the life in the village and the fields; they converse patiently—and wittily on occasion—with all and sundry, and clearly make friends wherever they wander. Moreover, though professing no archaeological interests, they miss little that is worth seeing, they have a rich store of memories of classical literature, and respond, as true Hellenists should, to local associations and historical sites. The impression made by Sparta, for instance, in contrast with the Acropolis at Athens, shows the author in solemn mood, and his analysis of his feelings as he stood on the site of the Brazen House convinces by its sincerity. On the whole, however, there is little occasion for solemnity in the narrative, and the author's gifts of felicitous description, even in dealing with the 'small beer' of travel, make the book a sheer delight from cover to cover. We realize, with him, that the essence of Greece lies not merely in the noisy and crowded streets of Athens, but in the countryside and its people, such as the pig-dealer of Vytina, who is thrilled at his first sight of the Olympia pediments; the hospitable shepherds on the wind-swept heights of Chelmos; the gloomy muleteer, who groundlessly accuses the corn-dealer of Kalavryta of stealing his watch; the genial abbot of the remote monastery of Proussos; even the wrangling chauffeurs in the square of Megalopolis. These—and many others—all come to life for the reader, and seem to fill just the right place in Mr. Kitto's picture. They are less eternal than the moonlight on the columns at Bassae, but surely they are the lineal descendants of the peasants with whom Pausanias and Plutarch gossiped—and at heart they have changed little in the interval. Unless we are grievously mistaken, Mr. Kitto, with his masterly but unpretentious skill in blending old and new, has written what deserves to become a classic amongst Greek travel-books.

A. M. WOODWARD.

University of Sheffield.

AN INTRODUCTION TO ROMAN HISTORY.

J. VOGT und E. KORNEMANN: *Römische Geschichte*. Pp. 186. (GERCKE-NORDEN: *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft*, III. 2.) Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1933. Stiff paper, RM. 7.80.

THE sketch of Roman history here presented to us by two eminent scholars, one of the younger, one of the older school, answers well to the general plan of the series in which it appears. It is not in any sense a full narrative covering the whole field of history: it is a genuine introduction, that gives us our bearings and suggests to us how we can use the sources, ancient and modern, for ourselves. The extreme compression makes connected reading rather difficult, but one is left at the end with the conviction that one will frequently have recourse to this volume, as to a tried friend in case of need.

On the Roman Republic Dr. Vogt has written with wide knowledge and eminently sound judgement. His general treatment of his subject is, in fact, as completely satisfying as anyone can expect in an imperfect world. He is fully in touch with modern research and able to maintain a balance between conservative and radical tendencies. If we must single out any point for comment, it is perhaps fair to say that, like many careful historians, he lets himself be frightened off the radical criticism required for the earlier history by the excesses of some radical critics. Where we come nearest to a certain check of tradition by archaeological evidence—as, for example, with the 'Servian Wall' or the earliest Roman coinage—the tradition is false past all saving. Is there much point then in working very much on the principle of passing off 'not yet proved false' as 'very possibly true'?

Professor Kornemann gives us a very noteworthy survey of the Empire, conceived of as extending till the Arab conquests of the seventh century. The Empire in its various phases, under successive changing influences, political, social, economic and religious, is displayed before us: we are allowed to see it through a pair of very observant eyes,

while we listen to a very shrewd and penetrating comment in accompaniment. There are few points of view of any importance that are not presented to us. Whether the angle of vision is always exactly right, whether every detail appears in its true proportion to the whole picture—these are indeed questions which will be differently answered by different readers. To quote only a few points: it is hard to reconcile Kornemann's view of the constitution of 23 B.C. (p. 60) with Augustus's own words in the 'Res Gestae'; they certainly do not suggest that, as K. thinks, Augustus resumed in 23 a good part of what he had resigned in 27. The very valuable discussion of 'libertas' (pp. 71-73) might be strengthened and completed by a closer use of the coins—particularly those of A.D. 68-69. The statement (p. 85) that 'Pius only developed what his predecessor had begun' will certainly not be accepted without question. Is there any justification for speaking of a 'final retirement' of the Senate from the stage of world affairs as early as A.D. 238? Did the prestige of the Empire stand lower under Diocletian than it had stood, say, under Philip the Arab? The question is surely not to be answered gaily with an affirmative, as seems here to be implied (p. 116). The evidence of borrowings from the East (pp. 139 ff.) needs careful scrutiny: dragon-trumpets—to take only one example (p. 143)—were, of course, known from of old in Gaul. The discussion of sources is extremely good and full. Here and there if seems, without good reason, to stop short with German scholarship. There is more temptation to criticism of the Empire than of the Republic, because of the vastly greater mass of available material. But it is safe to say that these weighty and authoritative pages of Professor Kornemann as well as the rather lighter built narrative of Dr. Vogt will long continue to invite inquirers and satisfy inquiry.

HAROLD MATTINGLY.

British Museum.

A NEW VOLUME OF THE LOEB CICERO.

CICERO: *De Natura Deorum, Academica.*

Translated by H. RACKHAM. Pp. xix
+664. London: Heinemann, 1933.
Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).

THIS volume deserves high praise. Every page demonstrates the translator's ingenuity and taste, as well as his scholarship and sound judgment. Both works are full of difficulties, by no means all of which are fully cleared up in the great editions of Mayor and Reid. The reader will seldom find reason to quarrel with either the substance or the form of Mr. Rackham's interpretations. A few comments on points of detail may be offered. *De Natura Deorum*, I. § 26 *neque sensum omnino* (sc. *esse posse*) *quo non ipsa natura pulsa sentiret* 'and that sensation in general can only occur when the subject itself becomes sentient by the impact of a sensation': ? 'and that there can be no sensation at all by which the subject becomes sentient without itself being struck (by something else).' § 37 *tangquam in vestigio* 'as a seal tallies with its impression': ? 'as a foot tallies with its footprint.' § 44 *insitas* 'instinctive': ? 'implanted' (so Mayor); this seems required by what follows, *vel potius innatas*. § 86 *Dubium est enim utrum dicat . . . Non animadvertunt . . .* 'It is in fact doubtful whether he means that . . . They fail to notice . . .': ? 'His words might mean either that . . .; but they fail to notice . . .' (the point being that, in spite of formal ambiguity, it is not at all doubtful what he really means). II. § 58 *atque ut ceterae . . . et sensibus*: a very obscure passage; but, in any case, *can suis seminibus continentur* mean 'are sustained each by its own seeds'? Perhaps 'are kept within bounds' (i.e. true to type); or should we read *continuantur*? § 61 *natura vehementius . . .*: R.'s rendering implies *naturam*. § 73 *quem ad modum quidque dicatur* 'the vocabulary of the subject': ? 'what our various statements are.' § 125 *a quo pleraque* 'from whom most of these cases are cited': ? 'by whom most things of this kind have been observed.' § 139 *nervos* 'nerves or

sinews': ? 'ligaments'; these may well have been confused with muscles, but hardly (see R.'s footnote) with nerves, though when nerves were discovered (third century B.C.) *νεῦρον* was the name given to them also. § 162 *est enim profecto divinatio* 'I refer of course to Divination': ? 'for assuredly Divination is a real thing.' III. § 9 *in hac subtilitate sermonis* 'in an abstract discussion like the present': ? 'when we are trying to discuss things simply and exactly'; the plain precise method of scientific discussion is contrasted with the flowery and exaggerated method of forensic oratory. § 56 *Pananatum* should be *Pana natum*. § 64 *ne suspicione quidem possum attingere* 'I have not the slightest inkling what it means': ? 'I cannot discern the slightest evidence of its truth,'—*suspicio* regularly seems to imply inference as opposed to mere instinct. § 86 *de amissa salute* 'his loss of all security': ? 'his ruin'—*Rutilius* was exiled.—*Academica* I. § 8 *in laudationibus* seems most naturally taken with what follows and not with what precedes; the Menipporean satires are for the *minus docti*, the funeral orations, like the prefaces in the 'Antiquities,' are for the philosophic. § 11 *haec inclusa habebam* 'I used to keep within close bounds': rather 'kept going in my own thoughts'; even when he was a busy politician he philosophized in private, and now (*nunc vero*) that he is out of public life etc. he is philosophizing more freely still. § 43 *verum esse autem arbitror* 'though I think it to be true': ? 'and I think . . .' (Cicero expresses his agreement with Varro's own view, § 35 *Zeno . . . corrigerem conatus est disciplinam. eam . . . correctionem explicabo, sicut solebat Antiochus.*) II. § 11 *in ista philosophia* ? 'in your school of philosophy.' § 14 *Et tamen isti physici . . . scire quam sciant* R. 'And nevertheless your natural philosophers do rather rarely . . .; although for the most part all your school seem . . .': ? 'And though, I must admit, your natural philosophers do (though very seldom) . . ., yet for the most part all of them seem . . .'

Isti in the second clause means the early physicists (*isti physici* of the first clause), not the New Academics, as 'your school' would imply. Lucullus is protesting against appealing to the old *physici* as supporters of agnosticism. § 18 *Plerique tamen . . . et rem idoneam de qua quaeratur et homines dignos quibuscum dissenserunt putant* R. ' . . . and they think that any fact is a suitable matter for investigation and that human beings deserve to have their views discussed': ? ' . . . and they think that the subject in question is a suitable matter for investigation, and that the persons concerned (sc. their Academic opponents) deserve to have their views discussed.' § 38 *animus . . . eripitur iis quos neque sentire neque adsentiri volunt*. R.'s rendering 'persons who refuse to exercise either sensation or assent are . . . robbed of the mind itself' implies the reading *qui* for *quos*, and gives unsatisfactory sense. § 38 *ut sit aliquid in nostra potestate* is a substantival clause, 'the possession of free will,' in apposition with *id quod maximum est*, which is the subject of *in eo . . . non erit*. § 39 *et quas adprobavit* R.'s rendering and note imply *quasi*, not *quas*. § 50 'for there is nothing that cannot be carried

over . . .' ('cannot' should be 'can'). § 59 *Si enim percipi nihil potest quod utrique visum est, tollendus adsensus est* R. 'For if nothing that has presented itself to either of them can be perceived, assent must be withheld.' This seems poor sense: keep (with Reid) the comma after *potest*: 'for if (as both of them held) nothing can be perceived, assent must be withheld.' § 85 *omnibusne partibus visa res nihil differat* R. 'whether an object completely within sight does not differ at all from another': ? 'whether a seen object is in all respects identical with another.' § 104 (end) *adprobari . . . impedirentur* R. 'were approved . . . hindered': 'are approved . . . hinders.' § 116 *geometrae provideant*: R.'s 'let the geometers see to that' implies that they are concerned with the theories that *nullam adhibent persuadendi necessitatem*: rather 'it is the geometers who must face my question' (viz. can anyone know the truth about nature?). § 126 (last word) *inverecundior*: R. translates *verecundior*. § 137 *ille noster* is Antiochus, not Carneades.

L. H. G. GREENWOOD.

Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

COLOUR-WORDS AND SOUND-WORDS IN VERGIL AND HORACE.

HERMANN GAUGER: *Optische und akustische Sinnesdaten in den Dichtungen des Vergil und Horaz*. Pp. vi + 81. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1932. Paper. RM. 6.

The nature of this book is adequately described by its title. Herr Gauger has collected all the words used by Vergil and Horace to express colour (i.e. visual surface value) and sound, and has, by tabulating them, shown their relative frequency. To the data derived by his own researches from the two Roman poets he has added, by way of comparison and contrast, those derived by other scholars from Goethe, Schiller, Chateaubriand, Bernadin, Shakespeare and others. Three types of table are given: one of the actual number of occurrences of any 'colour' or 'sound' word (e.g. 44 instances of *green* in Vergil; 12 in the *Elegies*,

14 in the *Georgics*, 18 in the *Aeneid*), one of the number per 10,000 words (e.g. '7 cases of *bird-song* in Horace; 1·2 in the *Odes* and *Epodes*, '4 in the *Satires* and *Epistles*), and one of the relative percentages of the different 'colour' and 'sound' words among themselves (e.g. 6·5 per cent. of Horace's 'colour' words are *yellow*).

After a short introduction to explain his method Herr Gauger examines all the colours in turn and concludes that red and yellow are Vergil's and Horace's favourites. (Homer before and Shakespeare after them showed a similar preference for red though not for yellow.) Green and still more blue are much less often mentioned, and in this connexion interesting evidence is brought for the fact that an appreciation of blue is a modernism. After the definite colour words (*bunte Farben*)

we have the visual surface value words (*die nicht bunten Farben*), including *white* and *black*. A comparison of these two classes shows a preference in his authors for *nicht bunt* to *bunt* in the proportion of two to one.

The acoustic data are dealt with in much the same way. After the presumed general conclusion that V. and H. in company with most of their successors (Schiller being a notable exception) prefer visual to acoustic epithets, we are given a detailed examination of 'sound' words in V. and H., these being divided under two main heads—'voiced' (*Stimmäusserungen*; i.e. human speech and song, bird-song and animal cries) and 'unvoiced' (*nicht-stimmliches*; e.g. thunder, sound from musical instruments, etc.). The relative frequency of these two main types in V. and H. is much the same, while Homer has four 'voiced' words to one 'unvoiced.'

The conclusions reached are in and for themselves interesting, and Herr Gauger is, we think, wise in discerning the hand of luck rather than of cunning. Only occasionally, and then tentatively, does he advance such theories as that

the fiery temper of Catullus led him to prefer red as a colour, or that the extraordinary number of 'green' references in the fifth *Aeneid* are intended as a contrast to the colourless underworld of Book Six. On one point, however (and it is an important one), Herr Gauger does not seem quite sound. The real difficulty of any such investigation as his in the realm of Roman poetry is the imitative nature of the poetry itself. When Horace calls a swan *purpureus* does he do so because it appeared to him *purpureus* or because his model called it *πορφύρεος*? Herr Gauger hedges. On p. 2 he assures us that the Roman poets' use of colour was more than a mere imitation of the Greek, but on p. 24 he tells us that Vergil saw his landscape with Homer's eyes and that the extraordinarily high percentage in the *Elegies* of *bunte Farben* is due to Vergil's imitation of Theocritus. But the difficulty is inherent in the subject, and though we may complain of Herr Gauger's blinking it we cannot blame him for failing to offer a solution.

M. PLATNAUER.

Brasenose College, Oxford.

A NEW TEXT OF APULEIUS' METAMORPHOSES.

Apulei Opera quae supersunt. Vol. I. Apulei Platonici Madaurensis Metamorphoseon Libri XI. Tertium edidit R. HELM. Pp. viii + 296. Leipzig: Teubner, 1931. Paper, R.M. 4.32; cloth, 5.40.

THE appearance of Helm's first edition of the *Metamorphoses* marks an epoch in Apuleian study. There for the first time (except in the *Psyche* story, where the Jahn-Michaelis collations of 1905 are still unrivalled) scholars found a really trustworthy report of F, adequately supported by information about Φ . They found also an excellent text, put together by hard and sober thought, and freed from the brilliant aberrations of van der Vliet's whimsical logicality. In 1913 came a second edition, carefully collated with new publications, but substantially unchanged. Now a third edition has appeared, dedicated, alas! not, like its two forerunners,

Friderico Leo, but manibus Friderici Leo.

At first sight this edition too might seem to be little changed. The pagination is unaltered, and page after page looks much the same as ever. But this impression is wholly misleading. Not only has Helm taken full account of new work, but he has addressed himself afresh to each of the bewildering succession of textual problems that his author presents. The preface, as in former issues, is reserved for the *Florida*.

Helm has not re-examined any MSS., and this puts him in an awkward position, since he must repeatedly choose between his own careful work of thirty years ago and Giarratano's fresh collations of F and Φ , which can be checked in part by my statements in the *Classical Quarterly* of 1924. On p. iv. Helm writes '(Rob) et (Giarr) additum significat lectionem allatam testimonio illorum

nisi': but he has used these symbols rarely and capriciously, and seldom or never records the fact of our *agreement*, which is important, since we worked independently. He accepts, indeed, most of what either of us has averred, but he might have put more trust in Giarratano when unsupported, though he is not quite always right. More than once Helm ignores new and true statements of Giarratano's, e.g. that in II. 8 (32, 1) F has a marginal variant *'l'po*, and that in II. 32 (51, 21) *inuado* has probably been erased in F's margin. He also repeats two false statements of mine which Giarratano silently corrected: that the last word of Book III is *rodebamus* (I fell into a trap which also caught a twelfth-century scribe), and that in IX. 2 (204, 7) F originally read *uenaculis*: I hope there are not many other cases where I have proved a false guide. Once or twice he ignores statements for which we both vouch; for example, that in VI. 18 (142, 9) F has *et*, as recorded in Jahn-Michaelis: here Helm's own collation is in direct conflict with our assertion (see *Phil. Woch.* 1930, 514), but he ought at least to have mentioned the divergence: he is, in fact, as I found again in 1926, definitely wrong. In general, however, the difficult task of revising his record of F and Φ has been carried out very carefully, and it would be captious to emphasize its defects.

With regard to the later MSS, he has not followed Giarratano in giving A a definite place, and the readings of all 'Class I' MSS (see *C.Q.* 1924) are either lumped under *v* or *dett*, or wholly ignored, even where their evidence is vital. A striking instance is VIII. 22 (194, 14), where the plausibility of my guess that F's erased variant was *luxurie sua*, a guess which he mentions, rested primarily on the *luxurie sue* of A E S. In this case the decisive fact, quoted from Beyte by Giarratano, that Petrus Victorius found *luxurie* legible in F's margin in the sixteenth century, ought also to have been mentioned. Helm's occasional references to the *Dorvillianus* are an explicable but absurd survival of van der Vliet's misconception. Here again it would be unfair to ignore the difficulty of recasting an existing

apparatus within rigid limits of space. The countless references to Φ are now largely unnecessary, but it would be foolish to object to their retention.

In any case the importance of this edition does not and cannot lie in its reports of the MSS, for which Giarratano (standing, as everyone must, on Helm's shoulders) is at present the best authority. Its importance lies in the judgment of a veteran Latinist, returning with extraordinary freshness of outlook to the difficulties with which he has wrestled so long, and illustrating and supporting his decisions by new references and quotations. He foreshadowed in some detail the general character of this text in several reviews, especially those of Wiman's *Textkritiska Studier* and of Giarratano's edition. On the whole he has moved in a conservative direction, and there is more banishment of old conjectures (including many of his own) than admission of new. He is now inclined to allow more latitude to Apuleius's language. For example he accepts Löfstedt's defence of *uadimus* in II. 32 (51, 10), Castiglioni's of *praeterimus* in III. 29 (73, 22) and Wiman's of *ruborem* in X. 2 (237, 16): but there are limits to his tolerance, and he is wisely deaf to much of Wiman's seductive piping.

He has greatly improved his ascriptions of emendations to their authors, largely under Giarratano's stimulus, but faults remain: for example in VI. 8 (134, 1) Roaldus should have the credit of Jahn's *familisio*, in VI. 26 (148, 7) Leo's *actutum* is Elmenhorst's, and in VII. 21 (169, 26) the altered order ascribed to van der Vliet was rightly given by that scholar himself as the reading of the *Dorvillianus*, and by Giarratano as that of A. Some other emendations ought to have been cut out, especially those which were based on readings of F now known to be false. It is unfair to Weyman to perpetuate in V. 17 (116, 20) the *procacis* which he evolved from Wilmann's misreading of F's *trucis*, and van der Vliet's suggestion in VI. 21 (144, 21) is equally obsolete.

Helm has accepted several new conjectures by other scholars, especially Castiglioni, whose readings appear in the text, for example, in I. 5 (5, 2),

IX. 20 (217, 14), and XI. 3 (268, 15) : these three are all plausible, but scarcely more. He has also suggested many of his own, and has put several into the text. The best are perhaps *in hortulos* for *mosculos* in II. 25 (45, 22), *set nec Dis pater* in VI. 18 (142, 8), *criminatos* for *criminatus* in VII. 23 (171, 11), and *semper cartulis* for *percasulis* in IX. 8 (208, 7). The excellent reading *amor* is in III. 15 (63, 13), which Helm adopted in 1913, was not, as he thinks, new, for Elmenhorst in 1621 quoted it as from a MS and Philomathes actually printed it,

clearly with intention, in the second Juntinge of 1522.

The printing is good, but some misprints have successfully jumped three fences, for example *uestustam* in XI. 5 (269, 23), an old friend of 1907 and 1913. Others new to this edition are 73 for 74 in the note on p. 73, l. 25, 19 for 14 and 11 for 21 in two notes on p. 125, and one that is rather more serious, the dropping of cross-strokes over three words in the note on p. 163, l. 25. D. S. ROBERTSON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

RECENT WORK ON CICERO'S LETTERS.

TYRRELL and PURSER: *The Correspondence of Cicero*. Vol. VI. Second Edition. Pp. cxxxii+412. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis and Co. (London: Longmans), 1933. Cloth, 21s.

H. SJÖGREN: *M. Tulli Ciceronis ad Atticum Epistularum Libri Sedecim. Fasciculus tertius libros IX-XII continens*. Pp. 210. Gothenburg: Eranos' Förlag, 1932. Paper, 6.75 kr.

THERE were various reasons why the appearance of vol. VI ed. 2 of 'Tyrrell and Purser' should be so long delayed. In the first place Tyrrell died; secondly there was much new work on the letters to be taken into account, and finally Purser himself died in 1932. We learn that he had passed pp. 1-368 for the press, and that the corrected proofs of the remaining pages were on his desk when he died. The manuscript draft of the revised Introduction and Apparatus Criticus was found complete and in order among his papers, and Dr. E. H. Alton has seen it through the press.

This volume differs from its precursor in being some 80 pages longer owing to the new matter in the Introduction and Commentary and to the larger type employed both in the text and notes. It is a relief to have Arabic instead of Roman numerals attached to the letters and a distinct improvement to have the footnotes on the Introduction indicated by numbers instead of ungainly signs. The matter of the book has been corrected and increased thanks to the work of many scholars. Among the names new to this volume appear those of

Ferrero, Rice Holmes, Tenney Frank, Bonduant, Lebreton, Reid, Sternkopf and, above all, Sjögren.

The Introduction follows the same lines as in the previous edition. The editor has, during the last thirty years, changed his mind in some particulars: e.g. p. xxii it was to Alba Longa (not Alba Fuentia) that Antony went on hearing of the revolt of the Fourth Legion; p. xxiii, it is no longer categorically stated that Cicero published the 2nd Philippic; p. xxxi, the agrarian law of 44 is now attributed to the consuls and not to L. Antonius. Comments that were apt in 1899, but are now out of date, are omitted, e.g. the sentence on p. xcix of the first edition about the 'excellent people . . . who work their employés fourteen hours a day.' Among the countless additions, chiefly to be found in footnotes, may be mentioned two long notes on pp. xxvi and xxvii inspired by Tenney Frank, the quotation from Peterson on p. li, and the long passage from Ferrero with which Purser concludes his sketch of Cicero. Altogether one could not wish for a fairer and more illuminating presentation of the political events of that portentous year (44-43 B.C.) and of the part Cicero played in them, or for a more just and sympathetic estimation of the character of the great orator himself, than is to be found in these pages.

Coming to the letters themselves, we find that the dates assigned have been altered in several instances. (Here it may be remarked that the notes on the

dates are among the best in the Commentary.) E.g. the date of 789 is now given as Dec. instead of Sept., 808 Dec. (end) instead of Nov. (end), 864 July instead of May, 812 is now broken up into two separate letters dated Sept. or Oct. and Dec. 20th respectively, and 813 is similarly divided. In revising the text Purser was obviously greatly influenced by Sjögren's work. One is struck by the frequency with which conjectures have now been given up in favour of the ms. tradition. The following examples out of many will suffice. At 811, 2 the ms. reading *volam* is rightly substituted for *volo*, 852, 1 *et cetera* for *etiam*, 865, 2 *altiores? sic patiamur* for *altiores si patiamur?* 866, 4 *descensurum* for *sit descensurus*, 897, 4 *idem* for *fide*, 899, 2 *videntur* for *viderentur*. On the same principle *id* at 826, 6, *tibi* 894, 2, *est* 899, 4 are now dropped, and *et te* at 909, 3 and *hoc ipsum nimium* at 914, 9, which were formerly bracketed, are rightly recognized as genuine.

In a few cases these alterations, we think, have not improved the text, e.g. 807, 5 *res familiaris* *movet*, *rem* *dico*? . . . *ne Terentiae* *quidem* . . . *Terentiam* *dico*? The note on this passage shows *rem* to be correct but gives no example of the change to the Accusative when the word repeated first stands in the Genitive, Dative, or Ablative. Hence perhaps Lambinus' conjecture *Terentiae* *dico*? is right.

842, 4 *Sestius causae non defuit post me, cum quanto suum filium, quanto meum in periculo futurum diceret, si contra proconsulē arma tulissent*. So Ganter punctuates. We cannot be persuaded that Cicero would have allowed such an anacoluthon to stand. (It ought at least to have been given a note in the Commentary.) The old reading was . . . *non defuit: post mecum, quanto . . . futurum diceret*. Perhaps *non defuit post me, cum <diceret> quanto . . . futurum diceret* should be read. In the next sentence *tamen* is now rightly omitted.

A tendency appears to prefer HD to M in some cases. At 860, 2, for instance, *sed* HD is rightly preferred to *sed si* M (*sed st vulg.*), 825, 3 *caecum* HD to *graecum* M, 838, 1 *quo progreedi* HD to *quoad (quod M)*; *ib. § 5* *fucata* HD is still read: *fugacia* (from *fugatia* M) is

perhaps safer. In the same section *omnia quae habent speciem gloriae collecta inanissimis splendoris insignibus* is strange and is not supported by *Phil. II 3*. Lambinus' conjecture *collectam* is an easy change and gives good sense.

But it is to Sternkopf that what is perhaps the most extensive alteration is due. There is much probability in his view (summarized on p. 117), with regard to 839 and 840, that fol. 1 ended at *cepit* 840, 3 and not at *id. April. ib.*, and that the words *mihi crede non erit*. <iii> *id. April.* belong to the end of 839. This view is adopted by the editor, so that 840, 3 now reads . . . *sin eam semel cepit t at in Asiam censeo persequendum*. The editor proposes *statim*, which may be right, for *at*, but his customary modesty has forbidden him to print it in the text.

Of other new readings we may mention 828, 2 HS [XX] (Manutius) for HS XX, 841, 5 *redit* (Orelli and Clark) for *redit*, 845, 3 *Viennam* (Sternkopf) for *Vienna*, 865, 2 *hortatio ne pudeat* (Sjögren's correction of Madvig's emendation) for *hortatur, ne eius pudeat* (*hortationi*s) mss.). There can be little doubt that these are right. At 874, 3 Madvig's restoration (certainly the best suggestion) in *legione quarta decima fraude C. Antoni* is now printed. At 870, 3 *nisi uno* is read, but the editor notes Sjögren's reading *si uno* with approval, and it should be adopted.

Some of the explanatory notes have been omitted or curtailed, but improvements and additions to others and the insertion of a host of completely new ones have greatly enlarged the Commentary. In a great many cases, instead of bare references to parallel or illustrative passages, we now have these quoted in full. Many points that formerly went unexplained are now adequately illustrated. The Commentary, in a word, is far more comprehensive and detailed than that of the first edition, and I doubt if there is a single page on which it does not show a distinct advance. And while the reader can have little ground for complaint as regards its fulness, we are compelled to admire the conciseness that has made it possible to keep the bulk of the volume within moderate bounds. It is

almost superfluous to adduce points for commendation. The excellence of the notes on dates has already been mentioned. A few instances, taken at random, of modifications or additions of an extensive nature are the notes on p. 30 *illis iiii viris*, p. 90 *honorum vocabula*, p. 212 *aliquid . . . esse delatum*, p. 240 *de decemviris*, p. 316 *quantum autem . . . committendum*.

A few further remarks may be added. Surely 815 should be headed 'From Q. Cicero in the country to Tiro at Rome.'

At 841, 1, where *et* is now dropped before *evocatorum partem*, a reference might have been given to the note on p. 334 *litteris et sermonibus*, where other examples are given of this colloquial or careless usage where two nouns coupled by *et* are followed by another without a copula.

P. 127, note on *partem . . . maiorem*. 'Twelve days later' should be 'six days later,' for the battle of Mutina was fought on the 21st, not the 27th, as was formerly supposed.

On p. 151 in the note on *id sibi * quoniam* the editor proposes *ἀδύνατον*, but rejects it because 'no Greek word occurs in the correspondence with Brutus.' But see *ἐμφατικώτερον Brut. I, 1, § 1.*

P. 316, note on *tironum . . . una*. May not Plancus mean merely that his *legio tironum* was superior to the other *legiones tironum* (of which D. Brutus had eight) and not that it was the best of all the legions, including those of veterans?

I have noted the following slips which should be added to the corrigenda. Correct *invitus* (p. lviii, note 165) to *invitus*; 1845 (p. cxxv, note 2) to 1745, 867, 3 (p. cxxxii, note 18) to 865, 3; October (p. 12, a 34) to September; *in* (p. 16, b 23) to *te*; 805, 2 (p. 38, b 22) to 804, 2; *licet* (p. 155, l. 4) to *licet*; *hos* (p. 216, l. 2 of letter 876) to *nos*; *restiturum* (in Latin heading of 900) to *restituros*; *oblivescere* (p. 349, b 1) to *obliviscere*. On page 31, a 6, 'assisted' seems a slip for 'assailed,' and on page 150, b 22 and 24 should be transposed.

This volume—a mine of learning—bears witness on every page to the editor's tireless energy and high qualities of scholarship, and his erudition

is made singularly attractive by the manner of its presentation. Courteous where he disagrees, generous in his appreciation of others, he inspires confidence by the firmness with which he puts forward his own point of view and by the masterly lucidity of his exposition. At the beginning of the century Professor A. C. Clark wrote: 'The English student can gratefully reflect that he is able to read the letters of Cicero in greater comfort and with the help of fuller knowledge at his disposal than anyone who is not familiar with his tongue.' These words, true then, can be repeated with even deeper truth to-day. Our one regret is that Dr. Purser was not spared to see the coping-stone set upon the revision of the great work he began with his famous collaborator half a century ago.

In the preface to the second edition of vol. VI of 'Tyrrell and Purser' we are told that Purser, had he lived to complete his work, would have acknowledged his particular indebtedness to Sjögren. The present edition of the Letters to Atticus is sufficient by itself to show that the gratitude of Purser and of all other scholars to Sjögren is well merited. We have here a text which is the result of the most painstaking study to which the MSS have ever been subjected, combined with a wide and deep knowledge of Ciceronian usage. Those who are familiar with the portions of his text already published will find the same tasteful and careful scholarship displayed in the present fasciculus. A summary of the principles on which the text is constructed will be found in *C.R. XLVI* 71.

At *Att. I, 14, 5* Sjögren added a word to our Latin dictionaries. He has now attempted to give a secure position to a word whose existence in our dictionaries has hitherto been precarious (*obtentare Att. IX, 10, 3*) and to add a word to Liddell and Scott (X, 12, 2). At the latter place the Oxford text reads *παρακλητέον igitur et occulte in aliquam onerariam correpondum*. The MSS give variants of *ΠΑΡΑΟΤΑΕΤΤΕΟΝ* or *παραθτλειτέον*. Sjögren reads *παραθλητέον*, which is nearer to the MSS than any other emendation. L. and S. cite *πάραθλον* from Schol. *Pind. Nem.*

the
eous
his
con-
ch he
and
pos-
lity
The
reflect
ers of
in the
posal
with
chen,
truth
Dr.
ping-
great
col-

ition
' we
ed to
now-
ess to
the
itself
rurser
en is
text
ains-
have
with a
onian
with
pub-
and
the
f the
con-
I 71.
word
now
to a
aries
ntare
ard to
at the
reads
quam
give
N or
rapa-
MSS
nd S.
Nem.

3, 42 as meaning 'a by-contest,' but we do not want that sense of *rapa* in the verb here.

His other emendations are to be found at IX, 15, 1 (*et hic VI et in*) X, 1, 3 (*est et magnum est*) X, 6, 2 (*de Q. fit a*) and X, 10, 3 where the MSS have *carti hinc istis invitissimis evolabo*. Here Sj. reads *káptei* (cf. Hom. *Il. XVII* 322, Hes. *Theog.* 73), which is paleographically perfect. But it is doubtful if it harmonizes completely with the immediately preceding sentence, which is *clam agam, cum paucissimis alicubi occultabor*. Something like 'by craft' or 'by stealth' is wanted (*caute* Olivetus, *furtim* Müller).

At XI, 14, 3 he suggests *avide te tamen* and at XII, 22, 3 *Lamiae esse, sed*, but does not print them in the text.

But, as before, it is not emendation so much as defence of the MS tradition that characterizes the text, and in countless places Sj. reverts to the MS reading where recent editors have admitted alterations. E.g., IX, 15, 2 *et magister equitum* (generally bracketed) is retained. X, 4, 6 *consilium mihi non decesset nec ad severitatem nec ad diligentiam*. Recent editors have needlessly altered to *indulgentiam*. X, 5, 2 *de quodam regendo* is restored for *de Quinto regendo*. At X, 9, 2 Sj. prefers, perhaps rightly, to convict Cicero of a *μνημονικὸν ἀμάρτημα* rather than desert the MSS, which all give *unicam filiam*. Most editors have changed this to *unicum filium* to make it agree with X, 9A, 1.

But though these and many other restorations may meet with approval, one feels that a line must be drawn somewhere, and an ellipse such as the reading of the best MSS involves at X, 8A, 1 *non possum dissimulare . . . famam . . . falsam agnoscere magni esse. trans mare credere non possum cum tanti facias Dolabellam*, seems too bold. None of the parallels quoted is quite so violent, and *te iturum* (which appears after *esse* in PIA^{2c}) or *te iturum esse* ought probably to be read.

At IX, 10, 3 (*spes quaedam me obtentabat fore ut aliquid conveniret*) *obtentabat* is retained presumably on account of Schmidt's defence of it (*Rhein. Mus.* 1897 p. 152 sq.), 'Warum sollte er denselben Gedanken (wie in

spes sustentat) nicht einmal mit dem ähnlichen Compositum *obtentare* variieren?' But it is strange that this variation, which one would expect to be common if it were good Latin, should be met with here only, and on the whole we agree with Müller that the word should be altered.

At X, 8, 7 *in suo lectulo* (usually and perhaps rightly bracketed) is retained in the well-known passage *nisi forte me Sardanapali vicem in suo lectulo mori malle censueris*.

There are also places where Sj. himself hesitates, e.g. XII, 38A, 1 where he prints *liberalissima* in the text though he is favourably inclined to *liberalis sit* (*Ur-sinus*), which we think ought to be read.

Sometimes however it is by resorting to the readings of MSS other than those which have usually found favour that Sj. differs from the Teubner or Oxford text. At IX, 9, 1, for instance, we have a good example of the preference he is inclined to give Σ over Δ . Here he reads with EO¹PR *tanto plus apud me valet beneficii gratia quam iniuriae dolor*. The reading usually adopted here is that of M³bdms, . . . *valere . . . gratiam . . . dolorem volo*. At IX, 7, 7 he adopts *quantum potest* Z¹ against all the other MSS, and at XII, 40, 2 XXX *dies in horto fui* CZ against the *hortis* of all other MSS. He justifies his choice in a note, 'in horto est in praedio rustico *scil.* Ficulensi v. XII, 34, 1.'

As in the previous fasciculi, welcome notes of this sort, defending or explaining the reading chosen at particular passages, are a feature of the *apparatus criticus*. It, indeed, in which nothing seems to escape the editor's watchful eye, is quite the fullest and most detailed we have seen, and it is bound to stand for many years to come as the most authoritative statement of the readings of the many MSS which contain these letters. The fasciculus, which concludes with a useful *tabula chronologica*, is printed in a clear and well-spaced type. We look forward with expectancy to the completion of this important edition of the Letters to Atticus.

E. J. WOOD.

University College of Wales,
Aberystwyth.

The Horse and the Sword. (The Corridors of Time, VIII.) By HAROLD PEAKE and HERBERT JOHN FLEURE. 8vo. Pp. viii + 152, with 62 illustrations in the text. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933. Cloth, 5s. net.

THIS volume carries the authors' reconstruction of prehistoric times from the Fall of Knossos and the close of the XVIIth Dynasty in Egypt to 'the Near East in the XIth century B.C.' and contemporary phases of culture in Hungary, Italy, North-Western Europe, and more briefly in Aryan India, and under the Chou Dynasty of China. To classical readers the centre of interest is in the earlier sections, on the Near East in the period of disturbance between the Fall of Knossos and the spread of the Lausitz culture into the lands round the head of the Aegean. Within it falls the traditional date of the Trojan War, and the authors' chronic pre-occupation with Hissarlik has full play here, following in the main Leaf's economic explanation of that episode, and linking it with the Lausitz crisis. Though the apparition of the leaf-shaped sword falls fully within this period, the coming of the horse anticipates it; and in general it has been difficult to handle events and tendencies in this period without presuppositions and cross-references. On the origin of the safety pin the authors suspend judgment in view of recent Danubian finds. An interesting example of interplay between quite distinct lines of enquiry is the suggestion (p. 94) that labialism may result from the spread of Indo-European speech from a short-lipped to a longer-lipped breed. But if the next *Corridor of Time*, as the authors' hint, is to be the last, their traffic control will have to be rather stricter than it sometimes is in this.

Oxford.

J. L. MYRES.

ANHΡ ΑΓΑΘΟΣ. JULIUS GERLACH. Pp. 83. Munich: Lehmaier, 1932. Paper, RM. 2. IT is always interesting, and often useful, to unravel the terminology of Greek ethics, and Herr Gerlach has chosen a good subject for his dissertation. The many meanings possessed by the words *ἀνὴρ δυάθος* at different periods of Greek literature justify a careful analysis of them. Herr Gerlach divides the main body of his work into two parts. In the first he runs through the main uses of the words from Homer to Aristotle; in the second he examines with greater detail their precise ethical meaning for Socrates and his successors. The results are not unexpected but still worth having. We see a phrase first used to describe any efficient or successful man, then gradually appropriated to a strictly ethical use. With the implications and meaning of this change Herr Gerlach is not strictly concerned, but his work will be a useful foundation for those who wish to study this important development in Greek thought. His survey is clear, if not exhaustive, and he risks hardly any unsubstantiated theories.

Herr Gerlach is inclined to place the moralization of *ἀνὴρ δυάθος* in the age of the Sophists, but here, like others, he postulates a change

more abrupt than what actually seems to have taken place. Simonides, who had absorbed something of Ionian enlightenment, had already assumed an ethical meaning for the words when he wrote his lines to Scopas, and there are traces of a similar attitude in the *Theognidea*. It looks indeed as if the notion of *ἀνὴρ δυάθος* was not altered but narrowed. A man like Pindar assumed moral excellence in his heroes as part of their comprehensive *δοτήρι*, and Aeschylus makes it part of the claim of Tydeus that he honours the throne of *Αἰολούνη* (Sept. 409). It was left to Socrates to limit goodness to a particular section of acts. Herr Gerlach has much of interest to say about the Greek notions of *αἰδώς* and *ἀλογόνη*, and especially about their relation to public opinion. But here also he over-simplifies. Simonides had enunciated *πάντα τοι καλά, τοιούτοι τ' αλογά μὴ μέμεντα*, and the conflict between the dictates of the individual conscience and accepted notions of right was dramatized not only by the sophistic Euripides in his *Bellerophon* but by the conservative Sophocles in his treatment of the sons and daughters of Aeolus. The development of moral ideas is neither uniform nor regular, and perhaps Herr Gerlach has found his task easier than it really is. But his book is worth reading and does honour to the teaching of Eduard Schwartz, by whom it is inspired.

C. M. BOWRA.

Wadham College, Oxford.

R. CANTARELLA: *Elementi primitivi nella poesia esioidea.* Pp. 45. (Estratto dalla Rivista Indo-Greco-Italica, Anno XV, fasc. iii-iv.) Naples: S.I.E.M., 1931. Paper.

THE author, who justly complains that Hesiod has had less attention given him than so interesting a writer deserves, sets out to examine the traces in his poems, especially the *Works and Days*, of what he calls primitive influences, meaning thereby early and especially pre-hellenic thought, forms of diction etc. Of traces of savage or peasant beliefs in him something is said, though not much; for instance, in commenting (p. 28) on *Works* 753-5 he rightly takes the scholium of Proclus as giving the substantially correct interpretation, and a few other passages show that he is not indifferent to this side of research and has some acquaintance with modern writings on it. But he is more interested in such things as Hesiod's connection with oracular diction, with Orphic and Orphic-Pythagorean utterances, and (this is perhaps the most noteworthy part of his article) with the very old and popular devices of assonance, rime and alliteration. He is sometimes too easily satisfied that he has found an association where it is to be doubted if any really exists, and also much too quick to assume that these features go back to a very high antiquity. He might do well to reconsider his dicta that the faint traces of something like tabu-speech in the poet testify to former use of the prehellenic language (p. 26), that savages regard everything as full of *orenda* (p. 25), that there is anything prehellenic (non-

to have absorbed already is when there are *gnidea*. *dyabb* an like heroes *h*, and *Tydeus* (*Sept.* goodness *Gerlach* Greek specially but here enunci- *gph m* dictates accepted by the but by ment of develop- m nor found s book teach- inspired. VRA.

hella nella 7, fasc. per.

Hesiod to inter- examine Works influences, y pre- c. Of in him for in- 753-5 clus as etation, is not and has s on it. ings as, in, with, erances, my part popular ization. he has doubted quick to a very recon- some- to p. 26), *orenda* (non-

hellenic there may well be) in either Orphism or oracles, and certain of his statements on literary history and on metre. But his general position, that Hesiod expresses peasant life and an old peasant culture, is both true and attractively set forth.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

K. MARÓT: *Kronos und die Titanen*. Reprinted from *Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni*, Vol. viii (1932/X). Pp. 48-82 and 139-214. Bologna: Zanichelli, 1932. Paper.

THIS long and elaborate article concerns itself with the distant past of Greek mythology and religion, dealing mostly with pre-Homeric conditions. It may be questioned whether, despite the very considerable learning and acuteness of the author, conclusions necessarily so hypothetical as his can have much permanent value. His results are as follows. Kronos, as he appears in Greek religion of the classical period and in literature from Homer on, is originally not one figure but two, a god who gave fertility but, to renew his powers, demanded periodical human sacrifice (hence such features as the swallowing of the children of Kronos and Rhea), and a figure of early myth, comparable to the Polynesian Tane-Mahuta, the leader in the primaeva separation of Heaven from Earth. The non-Greek name which somehow came to be applied to both these figures led to all manner of popular etymologies, especially to the familiar derivations from *κραία* and *χρόνος*, and these in their turn affected the god's mythology. The vehicles of this development in the earliest period, before Homer, were a poem telling the story of the son of Uranos with his 'crooked counsels' and another of genealogical type, not unlike Hesiod's style, which is indeed a revival of an old fashion. The Titans are solar deities, their name (which also was subjected to much etymologizing) arising in all probability from a ritual cry, that called in later times *τιτανισμός*, which came to be associated with the dancing movement of sunbeams.

How much weight is to be given to these arguments, and to many subsidiary ones from etymology, psychology and the comparative study of myths, is largely a matter of personal taste on the reader's part. The reviewer, though interested, is seldom convinced. The author, however, has enunciated a thoroughly sound principle when he protests, in the concluding pages, against treating religion, mythology and linguistics as though they were separate things, to the neglect of their continual and intimate interactions one upon another.

As details needing correction, it may be noted that on p. 58, note 2, Lykophron (*Alexandra*, 762) and not Porphyry should be given as the earliest witness for the mutilation of Kronos by Zeus; and, on p. 199, near the end of the long footnote, Australia should no longer be quoted as furnishing certain examples of 'unbekannte Konzeption,' i.e., ignorance of the male share in procreation, since the publication of Strehlow's researches.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

Tēlos ó γάμος. Door H. BOLKESTEIN. Pp. 27. (Mededeelingen der koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeeling Letterkunde, Deel 76, Serie B, No. 2.) Amsterdam: Noord-hollandsche Uitgeversmaatschappij, 1933.

DR. BOLKESTEIN clears up a misunderstanding by a critical examination of Greek usage; it is not the first time he has rendered this service to scholarship. Several lexicographers, supported by Artemidoros the dream-interpreter, say that marriage is a *τέλος*; one late writer, Maximus Confessor, in his notes on the so-called Dionysios the Areiopagite, goes further and says that it is a *reλεγία*. Since Ruhnken and, following him, Lobeck called attention to these facts, much theory has been built upon them, e.g., that Greek marriage was originally a rite of initiation like those celebrated at adolescence in the lives of many savages. The plain fact is that, since *τέλος* can mean a rite or ceremony, it is occasionally used to refer to a marriage ceremony; and so *παριτέλησα*, which is the sacrifice preliminary to any kind of ritual, is on occasion (not primarily) that preceding a marriage; Zeus Teleios is invoked to 'accomplish' the hopes of a newly married pair, Hera Teleia has a fairly close connection with marriage, since a 'perfected' or 'completed,' i.e., an adult Greek woman was normally a wife. But marriage was never thought of as an initiation or mystery, nor even primarily as a rite; while Maximus has illegitimately combined two of the many shades of meaning which *τέλος* can have, and his statement rests on no ancient authority. The argument seems quite cogent, and the reviewer has noticed no inaccuracies save some due to the printer, who needs more practice in setting up Greek words.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

De Codicibus Pindaricis. By ALEXANDER TURYN. (Polska Akademja Umiejetnosci: Archiwum Filologiczne Nr. 11.) Pp. 90. Cracow: Gebethner and Wolff, 1932.

THIS notable work is the prolegomena to a projected text. Turyn's examination of the MSS has led him to reject many of Schroeder's conclusions, and especially to abandon the view that the 'Ambrosian' recension can be recovered, in the absence of A, from the Parisian MSS C and V. Turyn holds that there never was an Ambrosian recension of *Pyth.*, *Nem.*, or *Isthm.*, and that the 'Parisian' class, which he calls 'C,' is a branch of the 'Vatican' class vivified by the guesses of Moschopulus.

If Turyn is right, his results are important. C disappears from the apparatus, and V survives only as a suspect supplement to better 'Vatican' MSS. His main concern is to establish two great divisions within the 'Vatican' class, grouped round B and G respectively, and to arrive at the true 'Vatican' reading by confronting them.

Turyn's general attitude towards C and V, which is not altogether new, seems to be right, but he goes too far in rejecting as conjectures all readings peculiar to them or the Byzantines.

Some such, especially δέντρα for δέντρω in *Pyth.* iv. 263, bear the stamp of authenticity. Turyn is altogether too rigorous in the elimination of variants, in view of the comparative lateness of *all* our Pindar MSS, and of the demonstrable interchanges of reading between their classes. There are also some chronological difficulties in his attempt to saddle Moschopulus with the credit of 'C's' peculiarities.

The last section consists in the critical treatment of a score of Pindaric passages, mostly from *Ol.* and *Pyth.* He is usually concerned to champion an unpopular reading against one supported only by 'C' or other suspects, and many of his arguments are impressive, especially those for ἀδαράτος in *Ol.* i. 60, for κεν in *Ol.* i. 109, for περὶρρη in *Pyth.* i. 35, for διαρρήγη in *Pyth.* iv. 155, and for πελέων in *Pyth.* iv. 223. Others are less attractive, but the whole section is an encouraging foretaste of Turyn's criticism.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

A. SEVERVYN: *Bacchylide: Essai Biographique.* Pp. 181. (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, Fasc. LVI.) Paris: Droz, 1933. 40 fr.

M. SEVERVYN has made an interesting experiment in writing a life of Bacchylides, and though his book is inevitably less of a biography than a discussion of several problems, the attempt was worth making. Too little is known of Bacchylides for a life of him to be written on the same scale as Wilamowitz's *Pindaros*, but he deserves some record to supplement, if not to supersede, Jebb's masterly Introduction. New discoveries have thrown light on his work, and M. Severvyn is right in thinking that the new results should be co-ordinated. His treatment is scholarly and severe, and perhaps he has restricted himself within too narrow limits. A biography may well contain more than dates and events, and M. Severvyn might have told us more about Bacchylides' opinions and methods of work. But within his limits M. Severvyn leaves little opening for criticism, and his work will demand the serious attention of all students of Bacchylides.

The book opens with a careful and original discussion of the dates of Bacchylides' birth and death. M. Severvyn concludes against former writers that he was born about 518 B.C. and was therefore almost exactly a contemporary of Pindar. The argument for this is supported with good evidence, and with it many difficulties disappear. The only serious objections to it are the statement of Eusebius that in 431 B.C. 'Bacchylides carminum scriptor agnoscurit' and the conclusion drawn from this that the poet saw the beginning of the Peloponnesian War. M. Severvyn's disposal of this myth by playing the *Chronicon Paschale* against Eusebius is delightfully adroit and perhaps conclusive. On this basis Bacchylides' life is established, and he is shown to have worked successively in Thessaly, Aegina,

Athens, Sicily, Ceos, and the Peloponnes. M. Severvyn attaches what works he can to the different periods, and we may note especially his treatment of the two Theseus poems. While XVII is a dithyramb written at Athens, he thinks that XVI was written about 474 in the early days of the Delian League and sung by a Cean choir at Delos.

The mysterious exile of Bacchylides is placed late in his life, and to it are attributed not merely the *Idas* but the two new lyric fragments recently published in *P.S.J.* X. These M. Severvyn assumes to be dithyrambs, but even if they are the work of Bacchylides, and not of Simonides or Ibucus, the title of the second, Λευκίστριτε, makes it possible that both are not dithyrambs but parthenenia, such as Plutarch (*de Mus.* 1136) says were written both by Simonides and by Bacchylides for the Spartans.

C. M. BOWRA.

Wadham College, Oxford.

W. J. WOODHOUSE: *King Agis of Sparta and his Campaign in Arkadia in 418 B.C.*

Pp. x+161; 4 maps and diagrams. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933. Cloth, 12s. 6d.

In this book Professor Woodhouse reconstructs the campaign of First Mantinea in accordance with a theory previously outlined by him in Vol. XXII of the Annual of the British School at Athens.

In the light of a careful study of the battle-site the author discusses the preliminaries of the action. He rejects Thucydides' statement that Agis drew his adversaries by threatening to choke the underground water-channels of the Mantinean plain, and attributes the king's success in forcing an engagement to his nicely calculated retreat from his original position close by the city.

The real crux of the book, however, lies in its explanation of the actual battle. With a wealth of ingenious argument Professor Woodhouse contends that the break in Agis' line was a deliberate trap for the Argives, and that the detaching of two Spartan battalions from the right wing to close the gap was a premeditated manoeuvre. No doubt Agis had his men better in hand than Thucydides suggests; and it certainly is remarkable that the losses on both sides were heaviest precisely where the Spartans would on political grounds prefer them to fall. But if Agis' scheme had been fully carried into effect, the picked corps of Argive oligarchs, whom the king admittedly had reason to let off gently, might have met its Cannae. In any case, we may feel some doubt whether Agis with a scratch force could have planned a stratagem more bold than any which Hannibal or Scipio attempted with highly seasoned troops—for Hannibal and Scipio, like modern generals, kept their reserves out of action until the decisive moment, whereas Agis had to pull his two special battalions out of the fighting line in which he had originally posted them.

Lastly, the author computes the numbers of the rival armies, which he assesses at a higher figure than other scholars. On his hypothesis

the Argive war-effort was more commensurate with Argive man-power than the traditional estimates will allow. But can Thucydides really have forgotten that each Spartan *lochos* was grouped with a Perioecic *lochos* to form a *mora*, and in consequence have reduced the Laconian line-battalions from 6,720 to 3,360 shields? Granted that the 'linked battalion' system, which had disappeared in the fourth century, was still in use in 418, how can we explain that at Leuctra the Spartans put far less than half of Professor Woodhouse's total into action?

First Mantinea may require to be fought some stages further. But all readers will be grateful to Professor Woodhouse for his vigorous and clean-cutting arguments. M. CARY.

University College, London.

GUIDO CALOGERO: *Studi sull' Eleatismo*. Pp. 264. Rome: Tipografia del Senato, 1932. Paper, L.40.

THIS volume gives an elaborate analysis of the recorded dicta of the Eleatics Parmenides, Melissus and Zeno, taken in that order. The author emphasizes the logical significance of Parmenides' teaching, rejecting the materialist interpretation; the central problem, he finds, is the meaning of *einai*. Melissus is expounded as the natural successor of Parmenides, rather than Zeno; and perhaps overmuch respect is here paid to his sadly confused thinking. Zeno appears as the over-zealous partisan, the veritable initiator of Dialectic but the involuntary destroyer of his own school of thought. These studies are followed by two chapters of special interest, on Gorgias and on the Platonic *Parmenides*. The author seeks to establish a sound tradition of Gorgias by a comparison between the pseudo-Aristotelian *De Melisso Xenophane Gorgia* and the record of Sextus Empiricus; he finds the former the preferable authority. The dicta of Gorgias are acutely analysed to bring out his irony in its destructive effect upon the Eleatic position. The *Parmenides* is worked through in detail, and is found to exhibit the same ironic spirit, and to have anti-Zenonian polemic for its central theme. Full justice is done throughout to previous work on the subject; and the footnotes, particularly in the chapter on Parmenides, contain much valuable comment on vexed passages. There is a useful index of names and references.

D. TARRANT.

Bedford College, London.

ARISTOTLE—*The Metaphysics*. Vol. I. Books I-IX. With an English translation by H. TREDENICK, M.A. Pp. xxxvi+473. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann (New York: Putnam), 1933. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).

MR. TREDENICK'S edition cannot fail to make the great treatise of Aristotle better known; it will help to introduce the general reader to the valuable work of Ross and Jaeger; and it makes available a reasonably

NO. CCCXLVII. VOL. XLVII.

cheap Greek text. For these reasons its appearance is very opportune.

The translation, if compared with that of Mr. Ross, presents certain obvious differences of style, which are natural in a work appearing in a more popular series. Thus the rendering is less literal, and no hard and fast rule is followed in the translation of technical terms. The result is a distinct gain from the point of view of English style. Mr. Tredennick also deserves high praise for the way in which he has made the argument clear in the very limited space at his disposal; the marginal summaries are very helpful, and so are the explanatory notes.

In reading the translation it has struck me that expressive Greek words have sometimes been watered down without good reason; e.g. in 'sane' for *νήφων* (p. 25), 'obscure language' for *φελλιγέρα* (p. 27), 'developed' for *πεπεμένον* (p. 53), and 'from a consideration of those thinkers who have already debated this question' for *παρὰ τῶν συνηδρευκότων ἔδη τῷ λόγῳ σοφῶν* (p. 41); in this last instance it rather looks as though *συν-* had been forgotten. I would criticize more definitely the version of *εἰ ὅτι μάλιστα* on pp. 23 and 119, where we want 'however true it may be,' or the equivalent. And I wonder whether *εἴδη* on p. 50 could not be the subject of *παρέχονται*, in spite of strict grammar. So Bonitz translates it.

Among accidental errors I have noticed a mistranslation of *τὸ ὡς δλῆθες δν* on p. 309, and the omission of a phrase, *τὰ δὲ τόπων οἷον τὰ πνεύματα*, on p. 405. These remarks may prove useful in the event of there being a reissue of the book.

The present volume carries us down as far as the end of Book IX, or Θ, to give it its more familiar name. The text taken as a basis is that of Bekker, but the editor has departed from it frequently, as is seen from a glance at the critical notes.

D. J. ALLAN.

Balliol College, Oxford.

Plautus. With an English translation. By P. NIXON. Vol. IV. Pp. vii+438. London: Heinemann, 1932. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).

THE appearance of a new volume of the Loeb Plautus (containing *Poenulus*, *Pseudolus*, *Rudens*) is a welcome event. Professor Nixon has performed no mean feat in maintaining the standard of his three previous volumes for close yet lively translation. The reviewer feels tempted to quote particular examples of pungent rendering—such as 'give a devil hell!' (*peccatum exemplum peccatum date*), 'birthday baby!' (*hodie natae*), 'man, man, try to be businesslike' (*uide sis quam tu rem geras*), 'tuppenny sluts of scummy slave-lings' (*seruorum sordidulorum scorta diabolaria*); or to illustrate the ingenuity with which word-play is reproduced; thus *non Charinus sed Copiast* becomes 'not Chariness but Profusion,' and *plebi scitum non est scitus* 'astute as a statue.' A more important point is that the scenes read well as a whole; particularly such cheerfully cynical passages as *Poen.* I. ii, where both Plautus and

his translator have scope to display their command of language. Occasionally the attempt to follow sound as well as sense results in rather strained English, as 'make an example of impudence and give rudeness its recompense.'

As before, Leo's text is followed; there are a few notes, critical and other; and both Latin and English have been printed with care.

W. BEARE.

University of Bristol.

Select Papyri. With an English Translation. By A. S. HUNT and C. C. EDGAR. In two volumes. I. Private Affairs. Pp. xx+452. London: Heinemann (New York: Putnam), 1932. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).

IT is long since the publishers announced that Professor Hunt had undertaken a selection of non-literary papyri to be included in the Loeb Classical Library. The pleasant anticipations which this announcement evoked have now been partly satisfied by the appearance, under the names of Professor Hunt and Mr. Edgar, of the first of two volumes, which has been devoted to private documents; the second volume will contain official records. Three-fourths of this volume have been assigned to the most numerous classes of private papyri, private letters and agreements (marriages, adoptions, sales, leases, etc.); there are also examples of receipts, wills, accounts, questions to oracles, Christian prayers, horoscopes and what not—the whole providing an infinitely varied picture of the private life of Egypt from the end of the fourth century B.C. to the seventh century A.D. An Introduction, Explanatory Notes, and a Glossary of Technical Terms smooth the path of the non-expert reader to whom the volume is addressed, and the sources of the documents are collected in an index at the end. Praise of the judgment shown in the selection of the documents, or of their clear and flawless presentation, would be impertinent.

W. M. CALDER.

University of Edinburgh.

Cicero, De Natura Deorum. Recognovit O. PLASBERG. Iterum edidit appendicem adiecit W. AX. Pp. xx+240. Leipzig: Teubner, 1933. Cloth, RM. 4.40 (unbound, 3.60).

A SECOND edition of Plasberg's larger *N.D.* was promised for 1930, but his valuable work on Cicero's philosophical books was cut short by his untimely death. With the aid of his MS. notes his smaller text has now been re-edited by Herr Ax. Ax's critical notes are fuller than is usual in this series, and there is an illustrative and explanatory appendix of nearly sixty closely printed pages, with quotations from the authors whom Cicero followed and those who followed him. The result is a valuable aid for a thorough study of the treatise.

As to the text, Plasberg was 'conservative,' swallowing e.g. I 1 *esse debet* in the sense of 'is bound to be.' But Ax is still more faithful to the 'best' MSS.: e.g. II 136 he prints *tum tñne spiritu dilatantur*, keeping the v.l. *in respiratu* and Plasberg's *in respirando* to the

note. When possible he ignores suspicions of adscripts, e.g. I 121 *Cobet's dei inter se [ab aliis aliis] neglegantur*, and conjectural insertions, e.g. II 91 Bothe's *Grauigena: de isto <c> aperit ipsa oratio*, a verse of Pacuvius. Sometimes probable emendations are not even noted, e.g. I 78 Dumesnil's *oratio* for *ratio* (where I also suggest *rationibus* for *orationibus* just below), and I 84 Manutius's *tibi* for *sibi* (*quam bellum erat . . . confiteri potius nescire quod nescires quam ista effundentem ipsum sibi dispicere*). At I 71 *hoc mirabilius quam uos inter uos risum teneri possitis* (*quam <ut> Plasberg*) Ax defends the omission of *ut* (as elsewhere of *si* and *cum*) after *quam* on the authority of three grammarians and five quotations (all five equally possible lipographies). He accepts II 145 *in pictis factis caelatisque formis* without comment, and keeps II 150 *ad pingendum fingendum, ad scalpendum* with a note '*<ad> fingendum* Ald., *ad ante scalpendum* om. dett.' Dittography is a familiar disease: why not omit either *pictis* or *factis* in the one and either *pingendum* or *fingendum* in the other?

Ax's 'conservatism' sometimes relies on doubtful parallels: e.g. II 163 *quae si singula uos forte non mouent, uniuersa . . . mouere debant* (v.l. *debabant*) is defended as *impermodestiae*, cf. Plaut. *Asin.* 392, 452 *si domi est, Damaenut uolebam*; but surely it is natural enough for a new-comer to explain his arrival by saying 'I wanted to see Mr. So-and-So.' II 165 *consultunt qui* (dett. *consultant iis qui*, Ald. *his consultunt qui*) is defended by Rep. VI 21 *in quo qui insistunt . . . urgent*, and by *N.D.* III 41, where *nam quos . . . peruenisse* is followed by *id fieri* instead of an exact antecedent to *quos*!

H. RACKHAM.

Christ's College, Cambridge.

W. W. EBANK, B.A., Ph.D.: *The Poems of Cicero*. Pp. ix+267. University of London Press, Ltd., 1933. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.

IT is convenient to have, as we have here, all the metrical writing of Cicero collected in one volume. But the title is surely a misnomer: there is no extant poem written by Cicero. The translation of Aratus's *Φανόμενα* contains about 500 lines; but it remains a fragment; and there is nothing else that can possibly be called a poem. The *Φανόμενα*, a kind of marine almanac, gave little scope for Cicero's fancy. The scanty remains of the *Prognostica* show more clearly the considerable influence that he exercised on the development of the Latin hexameter.

The text is here preceded by 21 pages of prefatory matter and followed by 150 pages of commentary. The treatment cannot be called clear or consecutive: there is no proper distinction between preface and commentary; and the reader never knows what topic is coming next. The proof-reading has been defective: we note 'wit' for 'whit' on p. 18, 'some time' for 'sometimes' on p. 20, *anguens* for *anguem*

on p. 35, *louis arcam* for *louis aram* on p. 36.

Cicero has still some reputation as a master of style. He would be surprised if he could read such a sentence as this (p. 39): 'Special qualities are needed in the reader who would enjoy the *Ph.* today, but if an interest in astronomy (and perhaps an academic interest in the poem as being by a man who was, in other departments, the greatest representative of his age) is his, he will find much to repay his perusal.'

This book is a thesis which obtained a degree. The authorities who conferred the degree might have suggested some rearrangement of the matter and some revision of the English.

J. D. DUFF.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

E. H. HAIGHT : *Romance in the Latin Elegiac Poets*. Pp. xii+243. New York: Longmans, 1932. Cloth, \$2.50.

THIS would have been a better book if the author had been content to write a straightforward account of the elegiac poets. As it is the reader is doubly distracted, partly by a piece of irrelevant lip-service to learning, a discourse on the influence or rather lack of influence of Latin elegiac poetry on the development of the novel, and partly by perpetual efforts to wrest the matter into some sort of relevance to the romantic title. The unreality of the former could not be better shown than by the author's candid admission in the last chapter, 'These brief accounts of Petronius' Satyricon and Apuleius' Metamorphoses are introduced to show how different the development of the Latin novel was from what we might have expected after a study of the romantic element in Latin elegiac poetry.' The all-pervading emphasis on romance is a more serious fault. The word may be a good bait to attract the sceptical and indifferent, but it does not pay to praise Latin poetry for being what we might like it to be rather than what it is; much of the love-poetry with which Professor Haight deals is by modern standards anything but romantic, and though she is obviously inspired by a genuine enthusiasm in thus emphasizing the relevance of ancient poetry to modern life, it is a cheap method which does no service to the cause she wishes to advance. Actually she prepares the way for herself in the first chapter by giving a most unsatisfactory definition of romance based on the subject instead of the spirit in which a subject is treated, and accordingly she is able to include even the *Ars Amatoria*, which could ordinarily be called romantic only by a rather sniggering euphemism. However, on whatever pretext, the book deals with the greater part of elegiac poetry from Gallus and Catullus to Ovid, and it is as a popular account of this that the book must be judged; students may well find it useful as providing a fuller description of the lives and works of the elegiac poets than most of the histories of Latin literature. A few statements require comment. Eratosthenes is wrongly

referred to as the author of *Aitia* (p. 13). 'He dared to denounce Antony openly' with reference to Propertius II, 16, 37, is a poor compliment to the poet seeing that Antony was long dead according to the usual dating which Professor Haight appears to accept (p. 87). Propertius IV, 11, is several times described without explanation as a letter from a dead author. The improbable view that Ovid *Amores* II, 6, is 'a travesty' of Catullus III, should not be stated as if it were an accepted truth, and there is still less justification for the statement 'he (Ovid) imitated other poets with such merry satire that Rome laughed with him' (p. 151).

D. W. LUCAS.

King's College, Cambridge.

EDGAR MARTINI : *Einleitung zu Ovid*. Pp. xv+102; portrait. (Schriften der Philosophischen Fakultät der Deutschen Universität in Prag.) Brünn: Rohrer, 1933. Paper, M. 8.

FEW of the learned are content to put down as small a proportion of what they know as was the late Professor Martini; in a hundred pages, more than half of which are bibliography and notes, he has given an admirable conspectus of what is known and guessed about Ovid. It is sometimes necessary to look in two places for the author's view of a question since variant theories may be discussed in the very full bibliography under the heading of the books in which they appear; but this should cause little difficulty.

Professor Martini was inclined to a conservative view of most questions; he accepted the Julia and Silanus explanation of Ovid's banishment and believed in the authenticity of the *Haliœutica*, *Liber Nucis* and all the *Heroïdes*; It is a pity that he should have treated with the same brevity less familiar views; his view, e.g., of the introductory epigram of the *Amores*, which he took to mean 'if my poems being expurgated are less piquant they are at least shorter,' the explanation with which he sought to support Ribbeck's view that the *Amores* were abbreviated in the second edition by the exclusion of grosser indecencies rather than of immature work. And one would like to know why he thought that the contrast between form and content in the didactic poems was not an intentional effect.

The few pages of literary criticism are adequate and conventional with a rather ungenial emphasis on that side of Ovid's talent which the German tongue is happy in being able to call *frivol-lasiv*. But it is questionable whether such criticism is worth while at all unless done at sufficient length to allow quotation; and the same applies to the chapter on Ovid's influence, which is often a mere list of names.

But these are slight faults in an excellent work, and it is to be regretted that the author's intention to write similar books on other poets must remain unfulfilled.

D. W. LUCAS.

King's College, Cambridge.

Sex. Propertii Elegiarum Libri IV. Tertium edidit CAROLUS HOSIUS. Pp. xxx + 190. Leipzig : Teubner, 1932. Cloth, RM. 4.40 (unbound, 3.40).

THE third edition of this well-known text is virtually reprint of the second. A few additions have been made to the Apparatus Criticus, and a few changes of spelling in the text are indicated, while in his third preface Professor Hosius has given a list of passages from Roman poets and prose-writers which testify to the influence of Propertius—a valuable addition to a most useful book.

H. E. BUTLER.

University College, London.

ROBERT WEST : *Römische Porträt-Plastik.* Pp. xvi + 264 ; 70 collotype plates. Munich : Bruckmann, 1933. Buckram, RM. 80.

THE preface says this book is intended for the general public as well as for experts, but I cannot believe that anybody would read it except as a duty. It is immensely long, though it deals with nothing later than Vitellius, and a large proportion of it consists of more or less abstract thought so overworded that a mere Englishman must labour if he will disentangle the sense : *Wurde hier ein äusserstes an kleinsteiliger, veristischer Formendetaillierung erreicht, so wurde dort ein Ausserstes erstreb an analytisch sersetzender Eigenschaftsschilderung.* The author has another failing equally deplorable in a popularizer : in her anxiety to get results, she puts too much faith in guesses, whether her own or others', and does not indicate the extent of possible error. She is apparently one of those who believe that every work of art should be datable within a decade or two, a doctrine which seems to me singularly inapplicable to Roman portraiture, because such allowance has to be made for the tastes and prejudices of the persons represented, and for the varied requirements, public and private, which the portraits were destined to fulfil. A Roman artist must often have met the same problem as the sculptor of the Haig figure, which looked too like the man to present the ideal field-marshall but was too much idealized to please his widow and friends. The several styles in Augustan portraits, which are here taken as distinguishing different periods in the reign, might receive a fairly satisfactory explanation on that principle. But while in this and other matters there is much that time may disprove, the book embodies a large piece of hard work and has advanced the study of its subject by its assembling and critical analysis of the material. (A detail : the Athens statue of fig. 86 is not the portrait of Ofellius at Delos, which is signed, not by Polycles and Dionysius, but by Dionysius and Timarchides.) The illustrations are all collotypes, sometimes as many as eight on a plate ; the lines of some of the smaller ones are so blurred that they give a less faithful representation than would half-tones, which might have taken their place on a larger scale at no greater expense.

A. W. LAWRENCE.

Queen's College, Cambridge.

Martial. Saggi critici di GIAMBATTISTA BELLISSIMA. Pp. xv + 291 ; 43 photographs. Turin : Paravia, 1931. Paper.

THE author of this handsome volume is a profound admirer of Martial, and the book has clearly been a labour of love. But having said this we have very nearly said all. Professor Bellissima has conveniently collected a good deal of information about Martial's life and works, and what he says does not provoke contradiction, but it does not appear that he has contributed anything to the solution of the many problems suggested by Martial's poems. The photographs are admirable.

E. A. BARBER.

Exeter College, Oxford.

Dr. ANNIE N. ZADOKS—JOSEPHUS JITTA : *Ancestral Portraiture in Rome and the Art of the Last Century of the Republic.* Pp. xi + 119 ; XXII plates. Amsterdam : N. V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers-Mij, 1932. Fl. 4.90.

A CERTAIN vagueness has been condoned in the accounts hitherto given of the most characteristic portraits of the Roman Republic. They have been associated more or less loosely with the death-mask of Ancestral Portraiture, and the term 'realistic,' or 'veristic,' has been applied to them in a most confusing way. They are in fact very far from being 'true to life.' Obviously what we need is a precise account of what a death-mask looks like, and what we may expect to find in a portrait copied, whether faithfully or not, from a death-mask. This is the main contribution of Dr. Zadoks' important thesis. In the cast of a face taken after death the bony structure becomes prominent, the eyes are sunken, the upper lip is elongated, the tip of the nose depressed, etc., but 'every detail, every little line and wrinkle, is smoothed away.' These and other points the authoress describes and illustrates once and for all.

By way of introduction there is a summary account—rather a useful working hypothesis than ascertained fact—of the indigenous, the Hellenic, and the local element in early Italic portraiture. The interesting suggestion is made that the Second—the 'bourgeois'—Period of Etruscan work is really native Italic. Then comes a full treatment of the origin and function of the death-mask, and of its employment as part of the ancestor-worship of the Roman *gens*. In connexion with the latter, it was high time that the two (only two) authoritative passages (Polybius VI, 53 and Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* XXXV, 6) should be sifted by an expert, and we are greatly indebted to Dr. Zadoks. The fact emerges, among others, that *imago* does not mean specifically 'death-mask,' but, quite generally, 'portrait.' What, then, of the so-called *tus imaginum*? References in Cicero and elsewhere do seem to warrant no more than the right (possibly only customary) of displaying the portrait of a curule magistrate *in public*. They do not imply death-mask or ancestral portraiture, or any restriction

of the right of an individual to keep any portrait he pleases in his house. But while Dr. Zadoks indulges in an indiscriminate slaughter of modern authorities, from Mommsen onwards, she has not quite succeeded in making clear the whole implication of such expressions as *ius imaginis ad memoriam posteritatemque prodendae* (Cic. *In Verr.* II, 5, 14, 36, with specific reference to the curule aedileship). There is still room for discussion of this subject.

J. D. CRAIG.

University of Sheffield.

C. Vellei Paternuli ex Historiae Romanae libris duobus quae supersunt post C. Halmium iterum editit C. STEGMANN DE PRITZWALD. Pp. xii + 176. Leipzig : Teubner, 1933. Paper, M. 5.60 (bound, 6.80).

THE construction of a text of Velleius must ever be something of a gamble. Where a tradition is so meagre and corrupt, and the consequent need of emendation ever present, no two editors are likely to remain in agreement with each other for long. Mr. Stegmann's text is on the whole reasonable and sensible, and, while many will disagree with him in particulars (to take but one instance, he leaves a predicative dative, not in Roby's list, and constructed with the verb *relinquere*, at II, 4, 1), yet his work is to be welcomed as marking a further advance along the difficult path of Velleian studies.

This edition is a revision of Halm's text of 1875, and S. reprints Halm's preface before giving an outline of his own aims and methods. But much has been written on Velleius since 1875, and one naturally turns to Bolaffi's edition of 1929 as a standard of comparison. Like Halm and Bolaffi, in opposition to Ellis, Stegmann believes A to be, like P, only an indirect copy of the Murbach Codex. But he seems on the whole to be more ready than Bolaffi (*a*) to choose A where P also gives a good reading (e.g. II, 10, 1 *natura A mature P*; II, 14, 1 *area A atrio P*; II, 65, 2 *desponsata A desponsa P*), and (*b*) needlessly to ignore P and adopt emendations where A does not satisfy him (e.g. I, 17, 5 *alitur aemulatione ingenium Stegmann, alit aemulatio ingenia P*; II, 70, 4 *Aegeati Steg. Aegeate P*; II, 104, 3 *spectator, tum Gelenius, spectatus P*).

Perhaps the greatest merit of Bolaffi's edition was that, while not rejecting sane and necessary corrections, it strove to check the tide of wholesale and indiscriminate emendation and, in accordance with modern study of Velleian peculiarities of diction and style, rightly restored the readings of A or P in many passages where editors had altered the tradition. B., of course, often went too far, and S., while acknowledging great indebtedness to him and frequently following him (even e.g. at II, 57, 3 *vis, cuius cum fortunam mutare constituit, consilia corrumptit*), has reverted in many such passages, though not always, we think, rightly, to conjectures.

Of his own corrections S. says . . . *paucissimas conjecturas addidi, praesertim cum in nova Bolaffi recensione emendationes invenirem,*

*quae mihi quoque ex statu studiorum Velleianorum sequendas visae erant. Those at I, 17, 5 and II, 70, 4 have been mentioned above. The others are to be found at II, 21, 3 (*sociis* transposed to follow *spectantibusque*. This does not commend itself); II, 26, 3 (*quantum huius gloriae famaque accessit nunc virtute feminae et propria latet*, which is better); II, 42, 3; 45, 5; 102, 3; 129, 1.*

The *apparatus criticus* is very full, and after the *Index Nominum* appears a list of proposed emendations for which there was no room in the *app. crit.* The pagination of the *editio princeps* is given at the top of the pages and the dates of the events described in the text are printed on the margin. We have noticed slight slips in the *app. crit.* on pages 14, 48 and 55 in the numbers referring to lines of the text.

EDWARD J. WOOD.

*University College of Wales,
Aberystwyth.*

H. STUBBE : Die Verseinlagen im Petron eingeleitet und erklärt. Pp. xiv + 186. Leipzig : Dieterich, 1933. Paper, M. 12 (bound, 14).

HERR STUBBE's work, which has grown from a doctoral dissertation to a Supplementband (XXV. ii) to *Philologus*, is careful edition, with German translation and critical and explanatory notes, of all the verse passages of the *Satyricon*. He is an indefatigable gleaner, and records the *vv. II.* diligently, and a great many conjectures, good and bad: he adds little of his own, and gives us no help at the real *cruces*, such as the Trojae Halosis 38-40

liberae ponto jubae

consentient luminibus, + fulmineum jubar

incendit aequor,

where he thinks that the jingle *jubae . . . jubar* is an intentional *Lautangleichung*, a poetic artifice, and is inclined to defend v. 39 by dropping the final *s* of *luminibus*, on the model of *tu dab' supplicium*. Nor do we get more help as to the critical intention of Petronius when he inserted the two long poems, the Trojae Halosis and the Bellum Civile, in his narrative: he provides material for future workers rather than endeavours to make an advance of his own. He ends with a very useful *Literatur-Anmerkungen zum ganzen Petron*, in which he has noted practically all the contributions to the emendation and elucidation of the text in periodical and other literature of recent years. I cannot think why he says that my 1910 Bibliography is 'mir unzügänglich': there is a set of the Bibliographical Society's *Transactions* in the Preussische Staatsbibliothek, and he writes his preface from 'Berlin-Steglitz.'

S. GASEEE.

FRITZ SAXL : Mithras : Typengeschichtliche Untersuchungen. Pp. xi + 123; 43 plates. Berlin : Keller, 1931. Cloth, £3 7s. 6d.

SINCE the publication of *Textes et monuments figurés relatifs aux mystères de Mithra* in 1896-9 there has been no lack of interest in the content of Mithraic monuments among stu-

dents and historians of ancient religion, and Cumont's views and interpretations have been widely accepted, in every country, as those of the leading modern authority on Graeco-Oriental cults in general and on Mithraism in particular. Archaeologists and historians of art, however, have greatly neglected, so Saxl maintains, the extensive material which Cumont has made available for them; yet a study of the stylistic development of these important religious monuments of the early centuries A.D. is essential for writing the history of Imperial and early Christian art. The time is now ripe for the publication of a new corpus of photographs of Mithraic monuments. Many of Cumont's illustrations are outline drawings only or inadequate photographs, both equally unsatisfactory from the artistic point of view, while a vast amount of new material, including such outstanding discoveries as the Dieburg reliefs and the paintings from S. Maria di Capua Vetere, has come to light during the past thirty years. Again, there is room for a new study of Mithraism in the light of recent work on the kindred cults of Cybele, Dolichenus, etc., and on 'Gnosis,' and in view, too, of the new attitude created by such works as Riegl's *Spätromische Kunstdustrie* and Wickhoff's *Römische Kunst* towards the artistic problems of the period to which the Mithraic monuments belong. Hitherto the study of these monuments has been practically confined to the study of their content by historians of religion; the purpose of the present work is to study them from the point of view of the history of art, and, in particular, to consider the significance of their art-forms. Generally speaking, Mithraic art created no new forms of its own; but it is in the selection made from the great inheritance of existing art-types, in the manner in which those types were remodelled and adapted, in the interpretation put upon their content and in the new associations in which they were placed—it is in the study of all these things that we may look for new revelations of the essence and spirit of Mithraism.

Saxl has certainly accomplished far more than his modest aim of supplying 'Vorarbeiten zu einer Typengeschichte der mithräischen Kunst': he has produced a comprehensive survey of all the important Mithraic art-types so far known to us, tracing their historical development and discussing their relationship to parallel types in the art of other religions, particularly of early Christianity. The book is divided into two parts: the first contains an analysis of Mithraic 'Bildformen,' the second deals with the religious significance of the various art-types. In Part II, Chapter VII, there is a specially interesting account of the revival of earlier motives in late classical art. There is an index to the text and a table of references to the 43 excellent plates, which, figuring 235 monuments in all, cover a field ranging from very early Oriental sealings and Minoan gems to the fifteenth-century tomb of Cardinal Jacopo of Portugal in San Miniato, Florence.

J. M. C. TOYNBEE.

Newnham College, Cambridge.

Eikota. Emendationen und Interpretationen zu griechischen Prosaikern der Kaiserzeit. Von ALBERT WIFSTRAND. I. Zu Dion und Josephus. Pp. 35. II. Zu Favorinus und Plutarch. Pp. 28. (Bulletin de la Société Royale des Lettres de Lund, 1930-31, III, 1932-33, I.) Lund: Gleerup.

MR. WIFSTRAND's notes, most of which concern Dio Chrysostom and Favorinus, show good judgment and clear thought, and deserve careful consideration of his emendations; those on Dio 9. 21 (*πίσταρες* for *ορίσταρες* or *στίσταρες*: cf. 57. 7) and 29. 9 (*ταύρη* *ηττόνα*) are particularly attractive. In several places he successfully defends the MS. tradition, e.g. at Dio 31. 3 (*ἀφελοῖσι*), where, however, Geel's <ā> still seems desirable, and 56. 16 (*περάθητι πάντα εἰσεῖν οὐτα λέγεις*). At 15. 1 he may be right in keeping *οὐχ* *ώς* *πλεύθερος* *οὐτα* (for *ώς* *οὐτα*), but when he extends the principle of the misplacement of the negative and of *οὐτα* and *τάντα* in phrases like *οὐ μετὰ πολλάς* and *οὐτα περὶ περιήλκων* so far as to defend lections like *κακῶς τῶν δοκούντων* *εἶνας* at Dem. 20. 135, which he calls 'offenbar recht,' his argument is hardly plausible.

The notes on Favorinus improve in many places on the restoration by Norsa and Vitelli of the papyrus fragments of the *Περὶ φυγῆς* (Pap. Vat. Grec. 11), first published in 1931.

W. HAMILTON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

CARLO GALLAVOTTI: *Luciano nella sua evoluzione artistica e spirituale.* Pp. xv + 241. Lanciano: Carabba, 1932. Paper, L. 10.

SIGNOR GALLAVOTTI traces the life of Lucian, fixing concurrently the influences to which events exposed him, and the effects of these influences as they determined his art and thought. The work is planned to succeed better than former attempts, by treating Lucian as primarily an artist, and by avoiding the errors which cannot be escaped if Lucian's work and thought are considered out of context, in isolated abstraction. The writer fully admits that there are dangers, for he has to deal simultaneously with more than one unknown quantity. He asks that his system should be therefore judged, as it is constructed, as a whole.

The account which he gives is coherent and generally convincing. Lucian's work falls into a closely dated scheme in which the production of each piece is intelligible. Only a very few—not even the *Macrobiti*—are rejected as spurious; the authority of the manuscript Γ becomes almost final on the principles of the book. Reliance, of course, must be placed on internal evidence, and this may be partly invalidated by Lucian's admitted artistic freedom. Much depends on the dating of the *Nigrinus* at about 159 A.D. But the evidence adduced is probably sufficient, with the mutual confirmation inherent in the method; and perhaps there is not after all very much departure in important particulars from the usually accepted schemes. Lucian himself receives a very favourable judgment. In early life he was frankly a sophist; afterwards he adopted and abandoned certain philo-

sophical views, and in the end, after rejecting Cynicism, accepted a modified Epicureanism, in which a solution of theoretical problems is found in the synthesis of practical life. It is maintained that Lucian, a natural aristocrat, and above all a humanist, was too honest to accept the absurdities current at the time in philosophy, paradoxically debased in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, or the still greater absurdities of religious cult, increasingly pervaded by extravagant superstition. For his outlook and solution Gallavotti well compares Lucian to Voltaire. But he is probably too lenient, especially to Lucian's lack of true philosophic and religious insight, to his unsympathetic estimate of Peregrinus, and to his flattery of Verus. At the present time, however, when some of the mental conditions of the second century have been recurring, a much truer estimate of Lucian than previously should be possible; and Gallavotti, though his style does not avoid the prolixity to which literary criticism is liable, has used the opportunity with ingenuity and understanding.

There are at the end of the book a biographical table, and an appendix on the manuscript tradition. The printing is careful and neat, although the price of the book is commendably low.

W. F. J. KNIGHT.

Bloxham School.

Eusebius: The Ecclesiastical History. With an English Translation. In two volumes. II. By J. E. L. OULTON. Pp. vii + 491. London: Heinemann (New York: Putnam) 1932. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.). The Loeb translation of Eusebius *Eccles. Hist.* was entrusted to Dr. Kirsopp Lake, whose translation of Books I to V was published in 1926 (noticed in *C.R.* XLI. p. 150). In 1927 appeared the S.P.C.K. translation of the whole of the *Ecclesiastical History* by [Lawlor and] Oulton (noticed in *C.R.* XLII. p. 44). In a preface to Vol. II of the Loeb translation Dr. Lake thanks Professor Oulton for relieving him of a superfluous task. This volume is a reprint of Oulton's translation of Books VI to X, with some changes (by omission and addition) in the notes, facing Schwartz's text, and followed by an index of the proper names in both volumes.

W. M. CALDER.

University of Edinburgh.

W. L. WESTERMANN and C. W. KEYES: *Tax Lists and Transportation Receipts from Theadelphia.* (Columbia Papyri, Greek Series, II.) Pp. xi + 219; 2 plates (facsimiles). New York: Columbia University Press (London: Milford), 1932. Cloth, \$6.00. WITH two exceptions (the fourth and fifth rolls), which relate to transport (the latter a list of donkey-drivers and their donkeys, the former a composite roll of receipts to the state bank from transport men and guards for payments of salaries and fees), all the texts here published are tax-registers of the second century. Not very attractive to the ordinary student and usually offering peculiar difficulties

of reading and interpretation, papyri of this class are yet often of great value for economic and, indirectly, for social history. This is certainly true of the present series, and the editors, in their detailed commentary, make excellent use of them. On many subjects besides the actual taxes involved, on methods of book-keeping, for example, and on questions of population, interesting light is thrown. One or two old *cruces* are here handled afresh with the help of new evidence; and if the editors' solutions are sometimes dubious, their discussions are always interesting and suggestive. They deserve hearty congratulations on the skill shown in their decipherment of the often very cursive and much abbreviated script.

H. I. BELL.

British Museum.

HENNING MØRLAND: *Der lateinische Komparationskasus und dessen Ersatz.* Pp. 26. Oslo: Fabritius, 1933. Paper.

THIS is a brief but interesting and illuminating discussion of the alternative methods of expressing *than* after the comparative in Latin. The author argues with some force that the ablative in comparisons is a sort of mixed construction. Many passages are quoted, particularly from Plautus. One of the important observations he makes is that the ablative is always employed after adjectives that have no positive. The extreme rarity of *quam* in Augustan and post-Augustan poetry is also noted: in fact the Augustan poets never use *quam* where an ablative is possible. There are misprints on pp. 5 and 7.

A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

ANDERS GAGNÉR: *Studien zur Bedeutung der Präposition APUD.* Pp. xvi + 178. Uppsala: Lundeqvist, 1931. Paper, 6 Swedish crowns.

THIS is a first-rate piece of work, in which the author gives a thorough treatment of this fascinating word, based on an excellent knowledge alike of method and of the bibliography of the subject. It is now about thirty years since the *Thesaurus* article *apud* was published, and a discussion suited to the requirements of the present day is most welcome. Beginning with the ground-meaning and the etymology, he passes to the development of the senses of the word. He suggests, as the result of a well-sustained argument, that *apud* is derived from *ad + por*: I should not be surprised if this theory becomes the accepted one. The narrow limits within which *apud* is used in the sense of 'to' are carefully defined, and the survival of this word in the French group only of the Romanic languages is pointed out. Many minor points also are skilfully dealt with. No one really interested in Latin idiom should neglect this work.

A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

Studien zur lateinischen Bibel. I. Augustins Locutiones und das Problem der lateinischen Bibelsprache. Von WILHELM SÜSS. Pp. 147. Tartu (Dorpat): Mattiesen, 1932. Paper.

THE *Locutiones in Heptateuchum* of Augustine contains many important and interesting observations on the text of that part of the Bible. Dr. Süss, who is a well-trained philologist, discusses these observations in the light of modern knowledge, under such headings as *grecisms*, individual words, *vulgarisms*, *hebraisms*, etc. The student of the Latin Bible will find this work well worthy of study. The book is well indexed, and its successor or successors will be very welcome. There is a misprint on p. 122.

A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

Tertullien, De Spectaculis, suivi de Pseudo-Cyprien, De Spectaculis: texte établi par ANDRÉ BOULANGER. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1933. Paper, 10 fr.

THIS is the first part of a new series called 'Textes d'Étude' among the 'Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg.' It is to be feared that it cannot be recommended on the score of correct printing, knowledge of bibliography, or accuracy in details; yet gratitude must be expressed for the new collation of the famous Agobardinus MS, as also for the collation of the oldest MS (at Paris) of the Pseudo-Cyprianic work, which it was a happy idea to append to Tertullian's famous treatise. The new information thus provided makes the edition indispensable to careful students of these writers, and the type is large and clear. As a book for class use, in the hands of a competent lecturer, it should be very successful.

On p. 5, n. 5, A. Beck, *Römisches Recht bei Tertullian und Cyprian* (Halle a. S. 1930) should be added; p. 16, add A. Degert, *Quid ad mores ingenique Afrorum cognoscenda conferant Sancti Augustini Sermones* (Paris, Lecoffre, 1894, thèse), and M. M. Getty, *The Life of the North Africans as revealed in the Sermons of Saint Augustine* (Washington, 1930); p. 23, n. 1, only some of the Agobardine treatises are in the first volume of the Vienna edition; p. 32, n. 1, it is quite wrong to say that the *Apology* alone had been published before 1545, as many treatises were edited by Beatus Rhenanus in 1521; p. 34, the fourth part of Thörnell's *Studia Tertullianea* (1926) is unknown to the editor; p. 35, it is a sign of great carelessness that the name of the chief writer on Tertullian's language and style, Heinrich Hoppe, whose two volumes are indispensable, is omitted altogether, and his new work (Lund, 1932) ignored.

A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

J. H. WASZINK: *Tertullian De Anima*, mit Einleitung, Übersetzung und Kommentar. Pp. vi+318. Amsterdam: H. J. Paris, 1932. Fl. 4.90.

THE *De Anima* of Tertullian is perhaps the most learned of all his works, and has a real

importance in the history of psychology. This might almost be called a full-dress edition. The title sufficiently describes its compass, and all parts of the book are worthy of commendation. Indexes of proper names, interesting words, subject-matter, and passages quoted are provided, though curiously the scripture passages have been omitted from the last. There is a fair crop of misprints, not all of which have been discovered by the author. The following points are of more importance. On p. 17 *Africæ* should be *Africanae*, and on the same page Von Dobschütz's edition of the *Decretum Gelasianum* should have been used; on p. 62 (225), Hier. in Matth. xiii 33 (Migne P.L. xxvi 94) might have been quoted in illustration; p. 203 *sophistam*, cf. Ambst. (*Study*, p. 33); p. 206, the *vpvōrora* are referred to also by Synesius, *Prov.* I, 9 (Migne P.G. lxvi 1228B); p. 207, the expression *bene quod* deserved a note; p. 208, *Eleazar* should have been annotated at greater length, and on the same page the Vienna edition of Ambrose on *Luke* should have been cited; p. 210, *praeiudicare* with dat., more exx. in *Study* of Ambst. p. 126, to which Jerome, Pelagius and a good many passages of Augustine *epist.* could now be added; p. 211, *effigio* is not an invention of Tertullian, but occurs in Apuleius (see *Thes.* s.v., to which add a passage in St. Patrick, where the true text has never been printed); p. 218, *inanio* is a favourite word of Ambst. (see *Study* p. 111, to which three other passages can now be added), and occurs also in Aug., cf. also Rönsch, *Semasiol. Beiträge*, III 47; p. 224, on *Erasistratus* add *Apol.* 3, 6; p. 233, for 'Adimantum' read 'Adimatum'; p. 236, for the depreciatory use of *alicuius*, cf. *Apol.* 50, 5; p. 246, *paredros* is found not only in Rufinus, as the editor says, but also in Iren. lat. I 13, 3 and in glossaries; p. 256, for 'ad Barnabam' read 'Barnabæ', and add § 9, as well as Iren. I 3, 4 etc. (see *Nov. Test. S. Irenæi* p. lxxvii); p. 280, Solinus is generally regarded as later than Tertullian.

A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

Quinti Septimii Florentis Tertulliani Apologeticum recensuit adnotavit praefatus est JOSEPHUS MARTIN. Pp. 176. Bonn: Hanstein, 1933. Stiff paper, RM. 6.

THE indefatigable Professor Martin of the University of Würzburg has produced this edition as fasc. 6 of the *Florilegium Patristicum*, to take the place of the second edition by Professor G. Rauschen, who died in 1917. It may at once be said that Rauschen's edition is in every respect outclassed. The new work is much fuller, both in annotation and in critical apparatus, and takes account of the new work done on Tertullian since 1912, the date of Rauschen's work. It is unfortunate that the readings of the oldest MS, at Petrograd, are not yet available, though complete photographs of it exist both in Belgium and in England. Yet the discussion of the textual situation in the preface is useful and welcome. The critical apparatus is a good deal fuller than that of

INDEX

I.—GENERAL INDEX.

Aalders' *Tertullianus' Citaten uit de Evangelien en de oude latijnse Bijbelvertalingen*, 152

Actes du Congrès de Nîmes (1932), 51

Adams (B. M.) On the Sophoclean Orestes, 209

Adler's *Suidas Lexicon* (Parts II), 28

Alexander's Notes and Emendations to the *Epistulae Morales of Seneca*, 77, 153

Allan (D. J.) on Tredennick's *Aristotle: The Metaphysics* (Vol. I), 241

ancient chemical warfare, 171

Anderson's *Alexander's Gate, Gog and Magog, and the Inclosed Nations*, 37

Anderson (W. B.) on Buecheler's *Kleine Schriften* (3. Band), 43. Obituary notice of R. S. Conway, 162

'animamque superbam' and Octavian, 169

Apollo in the *Oresteia*, 97

apud, 247

Arnaldi's *La Poesia dell' Iliade*, 202

Atkinson (D.) on Gummerus' *Die südgallische Terracottafabrik* 42

Aus Roms Zeitwende, 76

Austin's edition of Cicero *Pro Caelio*, 192

Bailey's *Phases in the Religion of Ancient Rome*, 21

Baker's *Justinian*, 197

Barber (E. A.) on *Mélanges Paul Thomas*, 84; on Bellissima's *Marsiale*, 244

Barker's translation of Seneca's *Letters to Lucilius*, 77

Barnard's *Res Gestae Populi Romani*, 28

Baynes (M. H.) on Baker's *Justinian*, 197

Beare (W.) on Jachmann's *Plantinisches und Attisches* and Kurrelmeyer's *The Economy of Actors in Plantus*, 140; on Enk's *Plauti Mercator*, 184; on Terzaghi's *Protagomera a Terenzio*, 206; on Nixon's *Plautus* (Vol. IV), 241

Beazley and Ashmole's *Greek Sculpture and Painting* 82

Becker's *Die Aristoteles Theorie der Möglichkeitsschlüsse*, 204

Beckmann's *Das Gebet bei Homer*, 82

Bede and Vegetius, 124

Bell (H. L.) on *Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Giessener Universitätsbibliothek* (III), 41; on Westermann and Keyes' *Tax Lists and Transportation Receipts from Theadelphia*, 247

Bellissima's *Marsiale: Saggi critici*, 244

Bensly's *Caesar, Civil War, Book I*, 29

Benz' *Marius Victorinus u. die Entwicklung der abendländischen Willensmetaphysik*, 86

Bethe's *Pollucis Onomasticon* (VI-X), 40

Bett's *Sons Secrets of Style*, 89

Bevan (E.) Version of Psalm XC in Greek elegiacs, 2

Björck's *Zum Corpus Hippocraticorum Graecorum*, 150

Bolisani's *Lucilio e i suoi frammenti* and *Quae Vergilius e L. vel haeserit vel sumperbit*, 185

Bolkestein's *Tēlos ó yápos*, 239

BOOKS RECEIVED, 47, 94, 157, 208, 250

Boulanger's *Cicéron, Sur la Loi Agraire, Pour C. Rabirius*, 87; his *Tertullien, De Spectaculis, suivi de Pseudo-Cyprien, De Spectaculis*, 248

Bowra (C. M.) on Lavagnini's *Nuova Antologia dei Frammenti della Lirica greca*, 125; on Jacoby's *Die*

Einschaltung des Schiffkatalogs in die *Ilias*, 174; on Arnaldi's *La Poesia dell' Iliade*, 202; on Lisi's *Poësie Grèche*, 203; on Gerlach's *Arché d'après*, 238; on Severyns' *Bacchylide: Essai biographique*, 240

Braunholz (M.) on Klein's *Child Life in Greek Art*, 202

Broadhead (H. D.) Tribrachs in Greek dramatic verse, 115

Bronner's *Corinthus* (Vol. X), 37

Buck's *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*, 205

Buckland (G.) on Runciman's *Byzantine Civilisation*, 198

Buckler (W. H.) A pagan recantation, 7

Buecheler's *Kleine Schriften*, 3. Band, 43

Burton's *The Discovery of the Ancient World*, 130

Buscaroli's *Il Libro di Didone*, 24

Bush's *Mythology and the Renaissance Tradition in English Poetry*, 147

Butler (H. E.) on Hosius' *Sex. Propertii Elegiarum Libri IV*, 244

Büttner's *Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Giessener Universitätsbibliothek* (III), 41

Calder (W. M.) Ox or owner? 220. On Hunt and Edgar's *Select Papyri* (Vol. I), 242; on Oulton's *Eusebius: The Ecclesiastical History* (Vol. II), 247

Calogero's *Studi sull' Eleatismo*, 241

Cambridge Ancient History (IX), 188

Cambridge performance of the *Oresteia*, 49

Cantarella's *Elementi primitivi nella poesia esiodea*, 238

Carmina Hoeftiana (1930, 1931), 31

Gary (M.) on Gomme's *The Population of Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.*, 224; on Woodhouse's *King Agis of Sparta and his Campaign in Arkadia in 418 B.C.*, 240

Cassirer's *Aristoteles' Schrift 'Von der Seele'* 83

Casson's *The Technique of Early Greek Sculpture*, 172

Cesareo's *Salustio*, 141

Charlesworth (M. P.) on *Aus Roms Zeitwende*, 76; on Kornemann's *Doppelprinzipat u. Reichsteilung* 143

Clark's memoir of L. C. Purser, 161; his *The Acts of the Apostles*, 194

Classical Association's meetings, 1, 49, 209

Classical Weekly summarized, 45, 90, 153

Clendon and Vince's *Clarendon Latin Course* (Part 2), 79

Cockle's *Intermediate Latin Reader*, 80

Cohen's *La 'Comédie' latine en France au XII^e Siècle*, 30

Cohoon's *Dio Chrysostom* (Vol. I), 39

Colson (F. H.) on Geiger's *Philon von Alexandria als sozialer Denker*, 85

Conway (B. S.) on Ramondt's *Illustratieve Woordschijking bij Vergilius*, 194. Obituary notice of, 162

Corinth (Vol. X), 37

Cornford's *Before and after Socrates*, 66

Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum (vol. VI partis IV fasc. postremus), 186 (cf. 249)

Craig (J. D.) on Jenkins' *Index Verborum Terentianus*, 22; on Zadoks' *Ancestral Portraiture in Rome* 244

Creed (J. M.) on Robertson and Davis' *A New Short Grammar of the Greek Testament*, 38; on Clark's *The Acts of the Apostles*, 194

Croissant's *Aristote et les Mystères*, 204

Cuttle (W. L.) on Regling's *Münzkunde*, 18; on A Guide to the Principal Coins of the Greeks from c. 700 B.C. to A.D. 270: 203

INDEX

D'Agostino's *Plinio: Il libro primo delle Epistole*, 39
 Dawkins (E. M.) on Pellegrino's *La Possia di S. Gregorio Nazianzeno*, 152
 Dawkins' *Leontios Makhairas*, 43
deceptus, 185
 della Valle's *Il Ciclope di Euripide* 225
 Denniston (J. D.) on Frisk's *Studien zur griechischen Wortstellung*, 18; on Bett's *Some Secrets of Style*, 89.
 Varia (I), 163; (II), 213
desinco e desinco, 219
 Dirksen's *The New Testament Concept of Metanoia*, 149
 Dobson's *Ancient Education and its Meaning to Us*, 89
 Drexup's *Die Schulaussprache des Griechischen Perioden der klassische Philologie*, 32; his *Das Generationsproblem in der griechischen u. griechisch-römischen Kultur*, 199
 Drew (D. L.) on Martinelli's *L'Odè d'Archita*, 25; on Glover's *Horace: A Return to Allegiance*, 88; on Rostagni's *Virgilio Minore*, 142
 Duff (J. D.) on Ewbank's *The Poems of Cicero*, 242
 Duff (J. F.) on Dobson's *Ancient Education and its Meaning to Us*, 89
 Duff (P. W.) on Jolowicz' *Historical Introduction to the Study of Roman Law*, 150
 Dunbabin (B. L.) Letter on Hannibal's route over the Alps, 44. Horace's villa at Tivoli, 55
 Dundas (B. H.) The transference of the Treasury in 454 B.C., 62
 Düring's *Porphyrios Kommentar zur Harmonielehre des Ptolemaios*, 70
 Duthie's *Readings in Roman Social History and Readings from Caesar* (Second Series), 29
 Elgee's *The Archaeology of Yorkshire*, 153
 Enk's *Plauti Mercator*, 184
 Esdaile's *Moments*, 1
 Ewbank's *The Poems of Cicero*, 242
exacriata, 187
 Fabricius' *Das antike Syrakus*, 16
 Farnell (L. R.) Pindar: a reply, 9 (cf. 61)
 Festa's *I Frammenti degli Stoici antichi* (I), 149
 Field (G. C.) on Cornford's *Before and after Socrates and Taylor's Socrates*, 66; on Shorey's *What Plato Said*, 181
 Fletcher (G. B. A.) on Valerius Flaccus, 14; on Boulanger's *Ciceron, Sur la Loi Agraire, Pour C. Rabirius*, 87
 Forbes (P. B. R.) Greek pioneers in philology and grammar, 105. Pindar, O. 8, 53-64: 167
 Fordyce (C. J.) on Bolisani's *Lucilio e i suoi frammenti* etc., 185
 Forster (E. S.) on Murison's *The Odes of Pindar rendered in English Verse*, 125
 Fort (J. A.) Version from Simmias, 113
 Fraser (J.) on Leifer and Goldmann's *Zum Problem der Foruminschrift unter dem Lapis Niger*, 87; on Kieckers' *Die Sprachstämme der Erde*, 89; on Honnorat's *Démonstration de la Parenté des Langues indo-européennes et sémitiques*, 206
 Frisk's *Studien zur griechischen Wortstellung*, 18
 Fürstlich Jablonowskische Gesellschaft essay prize, 161
 Gagnér's *Studien zur Bedeutung der Präposition apud*, 247
 Gallavotti's *Luciano nella sua evoluzione artistica e spirituale*, 246
 Gardiner's *The Theory of Speech and Language*, 146
 Gardner's *Greece and the Aegean*, 183
 Gardner (R.) on Rodd's *Rome of the Renaissance and Today*, 88
 Garrod (H. W.) on Housman's *M. Manilius Astronomica*, ed. minor, 26
 Gaselee (S.) on books of medieval and modern Latin, 30; on Stubbe's *Die Verseinlagen im Petron*, 245
 Gauger's *Optische u. akustische Strenesdaten in den Dichtungen des Vergil u. Horaz*, 231
 Geiger's *Philon von Alexandria als sozialer Denker*, 89
 Gerlach's *Artp. dyabōs*, 238
 Giles (A. F.) on Robinson's *History of the Roman Republic*, 86
 Giusti's edition of Cicero *Pro Ligario*, 192
 Glover's *Horace: A Return to Allegiance*, 88
 Gnomon summarized, 91, 154, 206, 249
 Gomme (A. W.) on Lavagnini's *Saggio sulla storiografia greca* and Taylor's *History as a Science*, 131; on Tod's *Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*, 132; on Ranulf's *The Jealousy of the Gods and Criminal Law at Athens*, 223
 Gomme's *The Population of Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.*, 224
 Gompertz' *The Master Craftsman*, 201
 Goaling (W. F.) Horace, *Odes III. 12. 4-7*: 220
 Gould's *Lucian's Charon*, 80
 Gow (A. S. F.) on Beazley and Ashmole's *Greek Sculpture and Painting*, 82. Sophron and Theocritus, 113; addendum, 168
 Grassi's *Il Problema della Metafisica platonica*, 36
 Gray (D. H.) on some school-books, 79
 Gray and others' *Latin for Today*, 79
 Greek pioneers in philology and grammar, 105
 Greenwood (L. H. G.) on Austin's edition of Cicero *Pro Caelio* and Giusti's of Cic. *Pro Ligario*, 192; on Rackham's *Cicero: De Natura Deorum, Academica*, 230
 Grunach's *Physis und Agathon in der alten Stoia*, 205
 Gummerus' *Die südgallische Terracottafabrik nach den Graffiti aus La Graufesenque*, 42
 Haarhoff (T. J.) on Afrikaans, 1
 Haber's *Comparative Study of the Beowulf and the Aeneid*, 200
 Hack's *God in Greek Philosophy to the Time of Socrates*, 180
 Haight's *Romance in the Latin Elegiac Poets*, 243
 Hall (F. W.) on Kenyon's *Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome* and Ullman's *Ancient Writing and its Influence*, 71; on Kraus' *Testimonia Aristophanea*, 83. Obituary notice of, 161
 Halliday's *Indo-European Folk-Tales and Greek Legend*, 222
 Hamilton (W.) on Cohoon's *Dio Chrysostom* (Vol. I), 39; on Heath's *Greek Astronomy*, 84; on Wilfrstrand's *Eikota* (I, II), 246
 Hammond (N. G. L.) on Nesselhauf's *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der delisch-attischen Symmachie*, 175
 Hannibal's route over the Alps, 44
 Hardie (G. C.) on Hardy's *Aristote, Poétique*, 68
 Hardy's *Aristote, Poétique*, 68
 Harrison (E.) on Drexup's *Die Schulaussprache des Griechischen und Perioden der klassische Philologie*, 32; on Bethe's *Pollucis Onomasticon* (VI-X), 40; on Wieneke's *Ezechielis Iuda Egarwyrh*, 85; on Johnson's *Latin Words of Common English* and Smock's *The Greek Element in English Words*, 89
 Hawkes (C. F. C.) on Vermeulen's *Een Romeins Graafveld op den Hunnerberg te Nijmegen*, 89; on Gompertz' *The Master Craftsman*, 201
 Head's *Guide to the Principal Coins of the Greeks* 203
 Heath's *Greek Astronomy*, 84
 Hedfors' *Compositions ad Tingenda Musiva*, 90
 Heitland (W. E.) on The Cambridge Ancient History (IX), 188
 Helm's *Rutilius Claudius Namatianus de redditu suo*, 196; his *Apulei Metamorphoson Libri XI*, 232
 Hertzog and others' *Vox Graeca* (I), 69
 Hirschberger's *Die Phronesis in der Philosophie Platons vor dem Staate*, 70
 Honnorat's *Démonstration de la Parenté des Langues indo-européennes et sémitiques*, 206
 Hoppe's *Beiträge zur Sprache u. Kritik Tertullians*, 40
 Horace and Actium, 3
 Horace's villa at Tivoli, 55

Hosius' *Sex. Probertii Elegiarum Libri IV.*, 244
 Housman's *M. Manilius Astronomica*, ed. minor, 26
 Hunt and Edgar's *Select Papyri* (Vol. I), 242
 Hutton's *Greek Cities*, 63

imago and *ius imaginum*, 244
Inscriptiones Italicae (Vol. XI: Regio XI. Fasc. I, II), 186

Jachmann's *Plautinisches und Attisches*, 140
 Jacoby's *Die Einschaltung des Schiffkatalogs in die Ilias*, 174
 James' *Hints on Latin Prose*, 79
 Jenkins' *Index Verborum Tertianus*, 22
 Johnson's *Latin Words of Common English*, 89
 Jolowicz' *Historical Introduction to the Study of Roman Law*, 150

Keenan's *Thasci Caecili Cypriani De Habitu Virginum*, 40
 Keith (C.) on Croissant's *Aristote et les Mystères*, 204
 Kendrick and Hawkes' *Archaeology in England and Wales* (1914-31), 41
 Kent's *The Sounds of Latin*, 151
 Kenyon's *Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome*, 71
 Kieckers' *Die Sprachstämme der Erde*, 89
 Kitto's *In the Mountains of Greece*, 228
 Klein's *Child Life in Greek Art*, 202
 Knight (W. F. J.) 'Animamque superbam' and Octavian, 169. On Gallavotti's *Luciano nella sua evoluzione artistica e spirituale*, 246
 Knight's *Vergil's Troy: Essays on the Second Book of the Aeneid*, 74
 Kornemann's *Doppelprinzipat u. Reichsteilung im Imperium Romanum*, 143. *See also* Vogt.
 Kraus' *Testimonio Aristophanae*, 83
 Kroll's *Die Kultur der ciceronischen Zeit* (I), 191
 Kurrelmeyer's *The Economy of Actors in Plautus*, 140

Lalstner (M. L. W.) on Treves' *Isocrate: Il Panegirico*, 137
 Landmann's *Eine Rede des Thukydides*, 65
 Langlotz' *Griechische Klassik*, 35
 L'Antiquité Classique (I), 51
 Last (H.) on Cesareo's *Sallustio*, 141; on C.I.L. VI, IV (fasc. postremus) and *Inscriptiones Italicae* XI, Regio XI (I, II), 186 (cf. 249)
 Lavagnini's *Nuova Antologia dei Frammenti della Lirica greca*, 125; his *Saggio sulla storiografia greca*, 131
 Lawrence (A. W.) on West's *Römische Porträts-Plastik*, 244
 Legrand's *Hérodote: Introduction and Livre I*, 134
 Leifel and Goldmann's *Zum Problem der Foruminschrift unter dem Lapis Niger*, 87
 Lewis' *Classical Mythology and Arthurian Romance*, 34
 Lindsay (W. M.) on Strzelecki's *Quæstiones Verrianae*, 78
 Lingraphone records, 51
 Lisi's *Poëtesse Grecæ*, 203
 Lister (H.) on Tod's *Sidelights on Greek History*, 20; on some class-books, 28
 Lorimer (H. L.) on Sinclair's *Hesiod's Works and Days*, 15
 Lorimer's *Aristotelis qui servit libellus De Mundo*, 182
 Loseby's *Advanced Latin Prose*, 30
 Lotspeich's *Classical Mythology in the Poetry of Edmund Spenser*, 147
 Lucas (D. W.) on Buscaroli's *Il Libro di Didone*, 24; on Haight's *Romance in the Latin Elegiac Poets* and Martini's *Einleitung zu Ovid*, 243
 Luckhurst (K. W.) on Nestle's *Platon, Protagoras*, 36
 Lyde's *A Patchwork from Pindar*, 36

Maas' *Epidaureische Hymnen*, 226
 Macdonald (G.) Bede and Vegetius, 124

McDonald's *Renati Rapini Hortorum Libri IV*, 31
 Mackall (J. W.) on Way's version of the *Elegies* of Virgil and Murison's of the *Bucolics* and *Georgics*, 73
 MacKay (L. A.) on Villeneuve's *Horace: Satires*, 38. Catullus 53, 5: 220
 McKenzie (R.) A note on Julius Africanus, 9 (cf. 171). On Björck's *Zum Corpus Hippocraticorum Graecorum*, 150
 Maguinness (W. S.) Two notes on the Panegyrici Latini, 219
 Marchant (E. C.) on Landmann's *Eine Rede des Thukydides*, 65; on Hertzog and others' *Vox Graeca* (I), 69
 Marot's *Kronos und die Titanen*, 239
 Martin's *Q. Septimii Florentis Tertulliani Apologeticus*, 248
 Martinelli's *L'Odè d'Archita*, 25
 Martini's *Einleitung zu Ovid*, 243
 Mattingly (H.) on Mickwitz' *Geld u. Wirtschaft im römischen Reich des 4. Jhdts. n. Chr.*, 27. (With E. S. G. Robinson) The prologue to the *Casina* of Plautus, 52. On Seltman's *Greek Coins*, 136; on Vogt and Kornemann's *Römische Geschichte*, 229
 Méautis' *The Mysteries of Eleusis*, 81; his *L'Amé hellénique d'après les Vases grecs*, 127
 Melitta (R.) on Meritt's *Athenian Financial Documents of the Fifth Century*, 176
 Mélanges Paul Thomas, 84
 Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome (X), 41
 mensorum = mensum, 187
 Meritt's *Athenian Financial Documents of the Fifth Century*, 176
 Mickwitz' *Geld u. Wirtschaft im römischen Reich des 4. Jhdts. n. Chr.*, 27
 Miller's *Dædalus and Thespis* (II), 148
 Milne (H. J. M.) More Baccylides? 62
 Minna (E. H.) on Rostovtsev's *Storia Economica e Sociale dell' Impero Romano*, 90
 Moore (R. W.) on D'Agostino's *Plinio: Il libro primo delle Epistole*, 39; on Rüdiger's *Sappho: Ihr Ruf und Ruhm bei der Nachwelt*, 148
 Mörland's *Die lateinischen Oribasiusübersetzungen*, 40; his *Der lateinische Komparationskasus u. dessen Ersatz*, 247
 Mountford (J. F.) on Düring's *Porphyrios Kommentar zur Harmonielehre des Ptolemäus*, 70
 Mühl's *Untersuchungen zur altorientalischen und althellenischen Gesetzgebung*, 128
 Mure (G. R. G.) on Becker's *Die Aristotelische Theorie der Möglichkeitschlüsse*, 204
 Murison's *The Bucolics and Georgics of Vergil rendered in English Hexameters*, 73; *The Odes of Pindar rendered in English Verse*, 125
 Murray (G.) on della Valle's *Il Ciclope di Euripiðs*, 223
 Murray's *Aristophanes: A Study*, 178
 Mustard's *Aeneas Silvii de curvalium miseriis*, 30; his *The Elegies of Henrique Cayado*, 31
 Mylonas' *Πρωτογραφικὴ Ἐλεύθερις*, 135
 Myres (J. L.) *Koukaras* and *Bouképhalos*, 124. On Drerup's *Das Generationsproblem* . . . , 199; on Nilsson's *Homer and Mycenae*, 221; on Peake and Fleure's *The Horse and the Sword*, 238

Nesselhauf's *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der dorisch-attischen Symmachie*, 175
 Nestle's *Platon, Protagoras*, 36
 Nilsson's *Homer and Mycenae*, 221
 Nixon's *Plautus* (Vol. IV), 241
 Noble (P. S.) on Gardiner's *The Theory of Speech and Language*, 146; on Kent's *The Sounds of Latin*, 151
 Nordström's *Asklepios och Läkare-staven*, 82
 Norwood's *Plautus and Terence*, 23; *The Syntax of the Latin Grund and Gerundiv*, 79
 nummus in Plautus, 53
 Nygren's *Agape and Eros* (I), 137

Oates' *The Influence of Simonides of Croton upon Horace*, 87
 Onians (R. B.) on Hack's *God in Greek Philosophy to the Time of Socrates*, 180; on Haber's *Comparative Study of the Bacchic and the Aeneid*, 200
 Orestes in Sophocles, 209
 Oulton's *Eusebius: The Ecclesiastical History* (Vol. II), 247
 Owen (A. S.) on Thomson's *Aeschylus: The Prometheus Bound*, 64; on *Symbolae Philologicae O. A. Danielsson dicatae*, 84
 Pagan recantations, 7, 62
 Palmer (L. R.) on Buck's *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*, 205
 Park's *Greek Mercenary Soldiers, from the earliest times to the battle of Ipsus*, 226
 Peake and Fleure's *The Horse and the Sword*, 238
 Peck (A. L.) on Grassi's *Il Problema della Metafisica platonica*, 36; on Nygren's *Agape and Eros* (I), 137
 Pellegrino's *La Poesia di S. Gregorio Nazianzeno*, 152
 Petrie's *Greek History, Antiquities and Literature*, 81
 Petronius, Jahn's notes and collations on, 45
Philologische Wochenschrift summarized, 46, 93, 156, 207
 Pickard-Cambridge (A. W.) on Treves' *Demostene e la Liberdà greca*, 149; on Murray's *Aristophanes: A Study*, 178
 Plasberg and Ax' Cicero: *De Natura Deorum*, 242
 Platnauer (M.) on Helm's *Rutilius Claudius Namatianus de redditu suo*, 196; on Gauger's *Optische u. akustische Sinnesdaten in den Dichtungen des Vergil u. Horaz*, 231
 Powell (J. U.) *Ἑκτλεύπον* and *ἐκτλεύπειν*, 210. On Maas' *Epidaurische Hymnen*, 226
 Powell's *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature, Third Series*, 126
 preparation and motivation in Greek tragedy, 117
 Psalm XC in Greek elegiacs, 2
 Purdie and Saunders' *Matriculation Latin*, 79
 Purser, L.C., 161. *See also* Tyrrell and Purser
 Rackham (H.) on Plasberg and Ax' Cicero: *De Natura Deorum*, 242
 Rackham's *Aristotle: The Politics*, 139; *Cicero: De Natura Deorum*, Academica, 230
 Raglan's *Jocasta's Crime: An Anthropological Study*, 151
 Ramondi's *Illustratieve Woordschikking bij Vergilius*, 194
 Ranulf's *The Jealousy of the Gods and Criminal Law at Athens*, 223
 Rattenbury (E. M.) on Söder's *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten u. die romanhaftige Literatur der Antike*, 39
 Regling's *Münzhunde*, 18
 Rennie (W.) The Oxford text of Demosthenes: a reply, 11
 replika-printing, 1
 Rhesus, date of the, 51
 Richardson (L. J. D.) Virgil, *Aeneid* XI, 154-7: 6
 Richmond (I. A.) on Fabricius' *Das Antike Syrakus*, 16
 Robertson and Davis' *New Short Grammar of the Greek Testament*, 38
 Robertson (D. E.) on Lyde's *A Patchwork from Pindar*, 36; on *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* (X), 41. Pindar: a rejoinder, 61. On Powell's *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature, Third Series*, 126; on Miller's *Daedalus and Thespis* (II), 148; on Helm's *Apulei Metamorphoseon Libri XI*, 232; on Turyn's *De Codicibus Pindaricis*, 239
 Robinson (E. S. G.): *see* Mattingly
 Robinson's *History of the Roman Republic*, 86
 Rodd's *Rome of the Renaissance and To-day*, 88
 Rohde's *Die Bedeutung der Tempelgründungen im Staatsleben der Römer*, 86
 Rollo and Satchel's *Quid's Metamorphoses*, 80
 Rose (H. J.) on Bailey's *Phases in the Religion of Ancient Rome*, 21; on Lewis' *Classical Mythology* and *Arthurian Romance*, 34; on Méautis' *The Mysteries of Eleusis*, 81; on Nordström's *Ashlepios och Läkare-staven* and Beckmann's *Das Geist bei Homer*, 82; on Rohde's *Die Bedeutung der Tempelgründungen im Staatsleben der Römer*, 86; on Bush's *Mythology and the Renaissance Tradition in English Poetry* and Lotspeich's *Classical Mythology in the Poetry of Edmund Spenser*, 147; on Wide and Nilsson's *Griechische und römische Religion*, 150; on Raglan's *Jocasta's Crime*, 151. Simonides and Glaukos, 165. On Halliday's *Indo-European Folk-Tales and Greek Legend*, 222; on Cantarella's *Elementi primitivi nella poesia esiodea*, 238; on Marot's *Kronos und die Titanen* and Bolkestein's *Tēlos ὁ γάμος*, 239
 Ross (W. D.) on Cassirer's *Aristoteles' Schrift 'Von der Seele'*, 83; on Rackham's *Aristotle: The Politics*, 139; on Lorimer's *Aristotelis qui fertur libellus De Mundo*, 182
 Rostagni's *Virgilio Minore*, 142
 Rostovtsev's *Storia Economica e Sociale dell' Impero Romano*, 90; *Caravan Cities and Out of the Past of Greece and Rome*, 129
 Rüdiger's *Sappho: Ihr Ruf und Ruhm bei der Nachwelt*, 148
 Rumpf's *Griechische und römische Kunst*, 35
 Runciman (S.) on Dawkins' *Leontios Makhairas*, 43
 Runciman's *Byzantine Civilisation*, 198
 Sage (E. T.) Letter on MSS of Petronius, 45
salapantum, salaputum, 220
 Salisbury (F. S.) *Στυλογραφία*, 62
 Sandbach (F. H.) on Knight's *Vergil's Troy*, 74; on Festa's *I Frammenti degli Stoici antichi* (I), 149; on Gramach's *Physis und Agathon in der alten Stoia*, 205. 'Victum frustra contendere Thysrum,' 216
 Saxl's *Mithras: Typengeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, 245
 Schneidewin's *Metaphysik der Sitten*, 149
 Schullian's *External Stimuli to Literary Production in Rome*, 75
secarunt, 249
 Seltman's *Greek Coins*, 136
 Severyns' *Bacchylide: Essai biographique*, 240
 Sheppard (J. T.) on Weinstock's *Sophokles*, 177
 Shorey's *What Plato Said*, 181
 Simmins' *Ἡρῷον ὑπὲρ τούτου Σοφοκλεῖς* translated, 113
 Simonides and Glaukos, 165
 Sinclair's *Hesiod's Works and Days*, 15
 Sjögren's *M. Tulli Ciceronis ad Atticum Epistularum Libri Sedecim* (fasc. tertius, IX-XII), 234
 Skeat (T. C.) *Terpæteria*, 211
 Smock's *The Greek Element in English Words*, 89
so - sum, 187
 Söder's *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten u. die romanhaftige Literatur der Antike*, 39
solipugium, 220
 Sophoclean Orestes, the, 209
 Sophron and Theocritus, 114; addendum, 168
 Sontar (A.) on Witte's *Geschichte der römischen Dichtung: Horazens Lyrik*, 38; on Hoppe's *Beiträge zur Sprache u. Kritik Tertullians*, Keenan's *Cyprianus De Habitu Virginum*, and Mörlund's *Die lateinischen Oribasiusübersetzungen*, 40; on Hedfors' *Compositiones ad Tingenda Musiva*, 90; on Alders' *Tertullianus' Citaten uit de Evangelien* and Tengblad's *Beiträge zur Kritik u. Exegese des Clemens von Alexandrien*, 152; on Mörlund's *Der lateinische Komparationskasus u. dessen Ersatz* and Gagnér's *Studien zur Bedeutung der Präposition apud*, 247; on Süss' *Studien zur lateinischen Bibel* (I), Boulanger's *Tertullian, De Spectaculis*, ... Waszink's *Tertullian De Anima*, and Martin's *Tertullianus' Apologeticus*, 248
 Stefanini's *Platone* (I), 83
 Stegmann von Pritzwald's *C. Vellei Paternuli . . . quae supersunt*, 245
 Stein's *On Ancient Central-Asian Tracks*, 249
 Strecker's *Hroswitius opera*, 30
 Strzelecki's *Quaestiones Verrianae*, 78

Rohde's *sieben dor
maisances
Classical
sor*, 147;
römische
me, 151.
y's Indo-
on Can-
dea, 238;
kestein's

'Von der
tistics, 139;
e Mundo,
' Impero
the Past of
Nachweil,
as, 43

74; on
149; on
Stoa, 205.

ungen, 245

duction in
77

anslated,
istularum

89

ie roman-
58

en Dic-
träge zur
oriana De
steinischen
positiones
rtullianus'
träge zur
152; on
u. dessen
der Prä-
ulis . . .
in's Tyr-
... quae

Stuart Jones (H.) on Adler's *Suidas Lexicon* (Parts II), 28
Stubbe's *Die Verseinlagen im Petron singuliert und erläutert*, 245
SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS, 45, 90, 153, 206, 249
Summers (W. C.) on Barker's *Seneca's Letters to Lucilius and Alexander's Notes and Expositions to the Epistles Morales of S.*, 77 (cl. 153)
Süss' *Studien sur latinschen Bibel* (I), 248
Symbolas Philologicas O. A. Daniellsson octogenerio dicatae, 84

Tarn (W. H.) on Mühl's *Untersuchungen sur altorientalischen u. hellenischen Gesetzgebung*, 128; on Rostovtzeff's *Caravan Cities and Out of the Past of Greece and Rome*, 129; on Parke's *Greek Mercenary Soldiers*, 226

Tarrant (D.) on Hirschberger's *Die Phronesis in der Philosophie Platons vor dem Staate*, 70; on Stefanini's *Platons* (I), 83; on Zeller's *La Filosofia dei Greci* (I), 148; on Schneidewin's *Metaphysik der Sitten und Dirksen's The New Testament Concept of Metanoia*, 149; on Calogero's *Studi sull' Eleatismo*, 241

Taylor (A. E.) on Benz' *Marius Victorinus* . . ., 86

Taylor's (A. E.) *Socrates*, 66

Taylor's (H.) *History as a Science*, 131

Tengblad's *Syntaktisch-stilistische Beiträge zur Kritik u. Exegese des Clemens von Alexandrien*, 152

Terzaghi's *Prolegomena a Terentio*, 206

The Year's Work in Classical Studies (1933), announced, 209

Thompson (D'A. W.) Ancient chemical warfare, 171

Thomson's *Aeschylus: The Prometheus Bound*, 64

Thomson (J. O.) on Anderson's *Alexander's Gate* . . ., 37; on Stein's *On Ancient Central-Asian Tracks*, 249

Tod's *Sidelights on Greek History*, 20; *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions, to the End of the Fifth Century*, 132

Toynbee (J. M. C.) on Saxl's *Mithras: Typengeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, 245

Treasury of Delos, date of transference, 62

Treble's *Revision Sentences for Latin Prose*, 30

Tredennick's *Aristotle: The Metaphysics* (Vol. I), 241

Treves' *Isocrate: Il Panegirico*, 137; *Demostene e la Libertà greca*, 149

tribrachs in Greek dramatic verse, 115

Türk Tarik, *Arkeologya ve Etnografa Dergisi*, 161

Turyan's *De Codicibus Pindaricis*, 239

Tyrrell and Purser's *The Correspondence of Cicero* (Vol. VI, 2nd ed.), 234

Ullman's *Ancient Writing and its Influence*, 71, 153

uimus 'weapon', 14

Vademecum für den klassischen Philologen, 51

Vermulen's *Ein Römisches Grafveld op den Hunnerberg te Nijmegen*, 89

vesti(s)pic, 187

Villeneuve's *Horace: Satires*, 38

Vogt and Kornemann's *Römische Geschichts*, 239

Wace (A. J. B.) on Mylonas' *Προστοπαχ' Ελεύθερι*, 135

Warmington (E. H.) on Burton's *The Discovery of the Ancient World*, 130

Waszink's *Tertullian De Anima*, 248

Way's *The Eclogues of Vergil*, 73

Webster (T. B. L.) on Langlotz' *Griechische Klassik* and Rumpf's *Griechische u. römische Kunst*, 35. Preparation and motivation in Greek tragedy, 117. On Méautis' *L'Amé hellénique d'après les Vases grecs*, 127; on Casson's *The Technique of Early Greek Sculpture*, 172

Weinstock's *Sophokles*, 177

Weat's *Römische Porträts-Plastik*, 244

Westermann and Keyes' *Tax Lists and Transportation Receipts from Theadelphia*, 247

Whittick (G. C.) on Kendrick and Hawkes' *Archaeology in England and Wales* (1914-21), 41; on Legrand's *Hérodote (Introduction and Livre I)*, 134; on Elgee's *The Archaeology of Yorkshire*, 153

Wide and Nilsson's *Griechische u. römische Religion*, 150

Wieneke's *Ezechielis Iudaei . . . fabulas quas inscribuntur Εβραϊκή fragmenta*, 85

Wifstrand's *Ethika* (I, II), 246

Wight Duff (J.) on Norwood's *Plautus and Terence*, 23; on Schullian's *External Stimuli to Literary Production in Rome*, 75; on Kroll's *Die Kultur der ciceronischen Zeit* (I), 191

Wilkinson (L. P.) Horace, *Epoche IX*: 2. On Oates' *The Influence of Simonides of Ceos upon Horace*, 87

Winnington-Ingram (R. P.) The rôle of Apollo in the *Orestea*, 97

Witte's *Die Geschichte der römischen Dichter im Zeitalter des Augustus: Horatius Lyrik*, 38

Wood (E. J.) on Tyrrell and Purser's *Correspondence of Cicero* (VII) and Sjögren's *Cic. Epist. ad Att. (IX-XII)*, 234; on Stegmann von Pritzwald's *C. Vallei Paternuli . . . quae supersunt*, 245

Woodhouse's *King Agis of Sparta and his Campaign in Arkadia in 418 B.C.*, 240

Woodward (A. M.) on Corinth (X), 37; on Hutton's *Greek Cities*, 63; on Gardner's *Greece and the Aegean*, 183; on Kitto's *In the Mountains of Greece*, 228

Wyllie's *Chancellor's Prize Latin Verse*, 31

Zadok's *Ancestral Portraiture in Rome and the Art of the Last Century of the Republic*, 244

Zeller's *La Filosofia dei Greci nel suo Sviluppo storico* (I), 148

II.—INDEX LOCORUM.

Note:—'passim' means that several passages of the author or work are dealt with at the given page.

Acta Apost. xx 4, xxiv 7: 196

Aeschylus Ag. 884 f.: 163. Cho. 879 f.: 164. Eum. passim: 97. P.V. 262: 65; 332-4: 164

Antiphon v 16: 216

Apuleius Met. passim: 232

Aristophanes Clouds 23, 438, fr. 135: 124. Etd. 273-7: 215

Aristotle De An. 427a 2: 83. Metaphysics I-IX passim: 241. Post. passim: 69. Pol. passim: 139. [Ar.] De Mundo passim: 183

Bacchylides (P.S.I. X no. 1181): 62

Catullus 53. 5: 220

Cicero Acad. passim: 230. De Nat. Dicor. passim: 230, 242. Letters (Tyrrell and Purser, Vol. VI, and Ad Att. IX-XII) passim: 234. Pro Caelio passim: 193

Demosthenes (Oxford text, Vol. III) passim: 11

Dio Chrysostom (Loeb text, Vol. I) passim: 39. 9 21, 15. 1, 29. 9, 31. 3, 56. 16: 246

Eumenius *Pro Instaurandis Scholis* 20, 2 : 219
 Euripides *El.* 512-4 : 213 ; 824 f., 893 f. : 211. *H.P.*
 965 f., 1092 f., 1094-7, 1206-8, 1234-6 : 213 f. *Med.*
 1181 : 210
 Ezechiel *Exagoge* 135, 207 : 85

Galen *De Sanitate Tuenda* 2, 10 : 210

Herodotus I 58, 59, 5, 165, 1, 193, 4, 196, 2-3 : 135
 Hesiod *Th.* 610 : 163
 Horace *Carm.* I, 7, 14 : 59 ; I, 28 : 25, 88 ; I, 37 : 5 ;
 III, 12, 4-7 : 220. *Epd.* ix : 2. *Sat.* I, 1. 88-91,
 6, 85-88, etc. : 38

I.G. I² 105, 296 : 176. IV 1² 129-134 : 226

Julius Africanus *Koersei* (p. 71 Vieillefond) : 9, 171

Leo *Tact.* 19, 58 : 9
 Livy XXI 31-4 : 45
 Lucian *Pro Imag.* 19 : 165
 Lucilius *passim* : 185

M.A.M.A. iv, 282 : 7, 62 ; 286 : 220
 Martyrium Petri Alex. p. 212 : 212

Ovid *F.* iv 851 : 84

P. Oxy. X no. 1294 : 211
 P.S.I. 678 : 213 ; 1181 : 62

Philostratus *Imag.* II 19, 1, 32, 3 : 216
 Pindar *Isth.* ii 35 : 10, 61. *Ol.* i 26 : 10, 160, 109,
 240 ; viii 53-64 : 10, 61, 167. *P.* i 35 : 240 ; iii 16,
 67 : 10, 61 ; iv 155, 223 : 240. *Fr.* 104, C, D : 10,
 61
 Plato *Rep.* 621B, *Phaed.* 103A, *Gorg.* 459A, *Laws* 718D :
 215 f.
 Plautus *Cas.* 1-28 : 52. *Rud.* 1314, *Men.* 1161 : 53 f.
Mrc. 314 : 185
 Pliny *N.H.* XIII 72, 77 : 72
 Pliny *Panegyric.* 77, 7 : 219
 Polybius III 39, 48 : 44

Rutilius Claudius Namatianus *passim* : 197

Seneca *Epist. Mor.* *passim* : 78 ; xlvii 1 : 153
 Simonides fr. 23 Diehl (8 Bergk) : 165
 Sophocles *El.* *passim* : 209 ; 900 f. : 213. *O.T.* 478,
 84 ; 677, 891-4, 971 f. : 164 f.
 Sophron, new fragments : 113, 168

Theocritus *Id.* ii 1-63 : 113, 168
 Thucydides IV 59-64 : 65

Valerius Flaccus i 94 f., 293, 307, 755 f., iii 196 f., 228,
 iv 87, 604, vii 194 f., 641-3, viii 448, etc. : 14
 Velleius Paterculus *passim* : 245
 Vergil *Aen.* ii 199 ff. : 75 ; vi 817 f. : 169 ; xi 154-7 : 6.
Ecl. vii : 216

III.—INDEX OF GREEK WORDS.

ἀλεθώ, 169
 διδύμησις, 36
 ἀντί ἀγαθός, 238
 βουκέρελος, 124
 γενέθλη, 163
 δεμότικος, 212
 διδάκτεσθαι, 167
 ἔκτλειρος, ἔκτλειρίζειν, 210
 ἔπακτός, 169
 εὐθόκοτα, 205
 εὐφόρβιον, 171

θραυστός, 214
 καθοδιός, 43
 καὶ μή . . . γε, 65
 κόλασις, 7
 κοππατίας, 124
 μετάνοια, 149
 ξένωσις, 213
 ὀδομήκοντα, 205
 ὀργή, 216
 πυκταλεύσω, 169

σαμφόρας, 124
 στηλογραφία, 62
 τελεσφόρος, 227
 τετράδερμα, 211
 τό ὡς ἐπί τὸ τοῦλο, 204
 τυλάριος δεμάτινα, 212
 ὑπόδημα, 213
 ὑποστρέφειν, -εῖθαι, 8
 χειροσίφωνος, 9, 171
 ώστε with participles, 163

109:
ii 16,
: 10,

7180:

53 5.

478:

f., 228,

4-7 : 6.

2

3

4, 163



Latin Text-Books

A SCHOOL LATIN COURSE

By G. A. MORRISON, M.A., LL.D., Headmaster of Robert Gordon's College, Aberdeen. An attempt by an experienced and successful teacher to give the rudiments of Latin through translation of complete sentences from the very first. It provides material for a three or four years' course. Part I., 2s. 6d.; Part II., 3s.; Part III., 3s.

LATIN TRANSLATION AT SIGHT

By T. D. HALL, M.A. Contains three hundred and fifty-five Latin passages of graduated difficulty well adapted for school use up to Matriculation standard. Limp cloth, 1s. 6d.; Cloth boards, 1s. 9d.; Key, 1s. 8d.

LATIN LITERATURE

By J. W. MACKAIL, LL.D., F.B.A. The Republic—The Augustan Age—The Empire—Index of Authors. 5s. net.

'Without a doubt the best and most complete work of its kind in English.'—*Daily News.*

LIMEN

A First Latin Book. By R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., D.Litt., F.B.A., and C. FLAMSTEAD WALTERS, M.A., 4s. Also in Two Parts. 2s. 6d. each. Teachers' Edition, including APPENDIX TO LIMEN, 5s.; Key, 3s. 3d., post free. APPENDIX TO LIMEN: Suggestions for Teachers on the Oral Method, and Dialogues for Acting. 9d.

ANTE LIMEN

A new Latin Book for Younger Beginners, based upon *Limen*. Compiled under the guidance of PROFESSORS WALTERS and CONWAY. By R. H. REES, B.A. *Ante Limen* is on similar lines to *Limen*, but is suitable for children under eleven years of age. 2s.; Key, 3s. 3d.

AD LIMEN

Being Reading Lessons and Exercises for a Second and Third Year Course in Latin. By PROFESSORS WALTERS and CONWAY. 3s.; Key, 3s. 3d.

JOHN MURRAY, 50 ALBEMARLE STREET, LONDON, W. 1

GODS, HEROES AND MEN OF ANCIENT GREECE

By W. H. D. ROUSE, Litt.D.

With 8 Illustrations

7s. 6d. net

The author never forgets that he is a scholar, and never allows us to forget that he is a wit and a humorist. Let us pretend that the phrase has never been used before, and therefore declare, because we meant it: This book will please children of all ages from ten to eighty. The heard-for-the-first-time, or the familiar stories of Greek mythology are told as parts of a connected whole; this book is The Rise and Fall of the Olympian Empire. The Greeks had a clear conception of the family histories of their gods, goddesses and demi-gods; here it is, complete with a family tree, and the stories remembered by celestial or earthly Nannies when their charges had grown up and become celebrated.

Ready early in 1934

JOHN MURRAY, 50 ALBEMARLE STREET, LONDON, W. 1

OXFORD BOOKS

ROME AND ITALY OF THE
REPUBLIC

By *T. FRANK*

Volume I of AN ECONOMIC SURVEY OF ANCIENT ROME

13s. 6d. net

SIDONIUS APOLLINARIS AND
HIS AGE

By *C. E. STEVENS*

12s. 6d. net

... He has digested the mass of authorities, ancient and modern, and has given us a straightforward narrative (painstakingly documented), a well-reasoned chronology, and, last but not least, an excellent bibliography. . . .

Times Literary Supplement

KING AGIS AND HIS CAMPAIGN
IN ARKADIA IN 418 B.C.

By *W. J. WOODHOUSE*

12s. 6d. net

... This penetrating analysis of the campaign in Arkadia in 418 B.C. will be welcomed for old acquaintance sake by those who, in their youth, studied Greek history, but, apart from this, there is much in these operations from which the modern soldier can learn useful lessons both of strategy and of tactics. . . .

Army Quarterly

THUCYDIDES AND THE
SCIENCE OF HISTORY

By *C. N. COCHRANE*

10s. net

... So far from the Thucydidean method being unscientific, this weighty and close-reasoned essay insists that the more perfect the methodology of the modern historian, the nearer he has approached once more to the standard set by Thucydides. . . .—*Spectator*

THE TECHNIQUE OF EARLY
GREEK SCULPTURE

By *STANLEY CASSON*

Illustrated. 25s. net

... The book remains a most valuable and original contribution to the study of Greek sculpture, and it is impossible to praise too highly the beauty of the illustrations or the care with which they have been selected. . . .—*Connoisseur*

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

